Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 2 of 212 PageID #: 2322 PROCEEDINGS 606 1 (In open court.) 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All Rise. 3 THE COURT: Everyone can sit down. 4 What order do you want to take this in? To me, it 5 makes the most sense to maybe have counsel clarify what 6 exactly your position is. You made sort of a Brady motion for 7 I think we took this extra period so you could 8 refine what the argument was. 9 MR. FRISCH: Here is just the highlights, then I can 10 give you the big pieces, then I'll do the small pieces after 11 if it's necessary. 12 Number one, I don't think any prophylactic measure 13 with regard to the ongoing trial would work. THE COURT: But I think what would be easier for me 14 15 is, what is Brady? What material do you think is Brady? 16 There are a number of 302s and what exculpatory 17 material is in there that -- and we are still on trial so that if the jury were to here about it, it had the potential to 18 19 change the outcome of the trial? 20 MR. FRISCH: Let me answer that. Let me preface my 21 answer, to protect the record, which is that I don't want to 22 be in the position if there is a conviction and if there is no 23 remedy in district court of being accused on appeal of not,

under the circumstances and given the timing, that I'm not

adequately or that I left something out of my objection.

24

- 1 before I answer your question, I want to be sure that I say
- 2 that I do want to address this in writing so I make all my
- 3 arguments.
- 4 Having said that let me answer your question.
- 5 THE COURT: Just taking that, do you have anything
- 6 prepared in writing?
- 7 MR. FRISCH: I don't. I read these after preparing
- 8 for Mr. Mackey today, this morning and last night, I read
- 9 everything for the first time comprehensively so I can
- 10 summarize my arguments why I think it's a Brady violation.
- 11 THE COURT: What are you asking me to do then? You
- want to submit something in writing?
- MR. FRISCH: I think the only --
- 14 THE COURT: Can you give it to me by tomorrow?
- MR. FRISCH: I just, I can try. This is -- look --
- 16 this is not my fault.
- 17 THE COURT: I'm just -- I'm a very simple person.
- 18 I'm just trying to get clarity on what you want.
- MR. FRISCH: Let me answer you.
- THE COURT: I want you to do it the way I want you
- 21 to do it so I understand it.
- MR. FRISCH: Let me --
- 23 THE COURT: It is frequently the case in trials in
- 24 this courthouse, and in other courthouses, that a legal issue
- comes up that is a complicated legal issue that lawyers handle

orally. So let's try it that way first. And if I feel that I need to have something clarified, or that I need more argument on it then I'll take it in writing. But I'm not aware of any requirement in the middle of a trial that requires a Court to put a hold on everything while people do a full briefing on something. My mind is not closed to it.

But what I'm most interested now is an identification of the 302s that were given to you, so I know what to look at. So if you can look at which witnesses you believe have Brady material in the 302s, and what it is that the material is that is exculpatory, and then we'll take it from there.

There are a number of these 302s, which are the ones that you assert contain Brady material?

MR. FRISCH: So the short answer -- let me go through it, let me go through it and tell you what I think is Brady material.

I think the specific ones, I think all of is this Brady material in substance, but the specific ones which is the most concerning to me are Alexandria Witt, Ms. Karr, the witness whose last name is Ayoubi, A-Y-O-U-B-I, Monett, M-O-N-E-T-T, Mr. Or Ms. Ball. I didn't make a list by witness, so there may be more. I'm doing the best I can.

If I can just I'll try to answer your question as to what I think is the Brady and why this is a problem. I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS 609 that the problems include the following. I think the principle -- I think we start with Rocketto. Rocketto is the equivalent to calling a witness to identified the defendant from a line up without giving the defendant the information that others didn't. So for example --THE COURT: So what is the information that would be helpful? MR. FRISCH: Okay. So Witt is one of the witnesses, Karr is another, who basically say that they, that this was not a big deal to the Clinton campaign. That they didn't see it as worth reporting to the Government. That no one even reported it to Twitter, at least initially. That there were, there was not just one person doing it, it was all over the Internet. That there was misuse of the Clinton logo pervasively on the Internet. That there were teams of people, not just one person, Ms. Karr, but it turns out there were teams of people, lots of them, not just monitoring the Internet precisely for this sort of thing, but they were making records of it. There is a number of witnesses who talk about creating, I think Mr. Ball if it's Mr. Ball, talked about scraping content from 4chan into a slack channel. There was

talk by Mr. Ball about a daily PowerPoint presentation about trends in voter disruption.

> THE COURT: Let me stop you there. I think I

understand what you're saying.

With respect to the issue -- the e-ma

With respect to the issue -- the e-mail telling people they could text to vote was not a big deal to the Clinton campaign. Why is that Brady material what their opinion of it is?

MR. FRISCH: Because they called Ms. Rocketto to essentially testify how horrible this was. How something had to be done right away. How she recognized this as a problem. That it specifically, in her view, was either targeted to or designed to affect or had the affect of effecting Latin

American and African American voters. She was a terrific — she's very charismatic and had a lot to say, that's fine — THE COURT: Why is someone —

MR. FRISCH: But I couldn't cross-examine her with this information.

THE COURT: But you opened on it.

MR. FRISCH: But I didn't know that the Clinton campaign agreed with my defense.

THE COURT: But who cares what their opinion is.

The Clinton campaign can't testify in court about what they think about something, any more than they can come -- you didn't object to it, she did say something was sneaky, I think I stopped her at some point. A particular person's opinion of what the case is, I don't understand how that is Brady material.

611

1 MR. FRISCH: If the Government had not called her, I 2 still think this is Brady material. But she testified to a 3 view of the case essentially, and the Government put this in 4 issue, whether whatever word she used, I didn't have the 5 material with which to cross-examine her. I didn't 6 cross-examine her at all. I think I asked one question from 7 her, I can't remember what it was. I would have had an extensive cross-examination of 8 9 her. Not just that she represents one voice of the Clinton 10 campaign of which there were literally armies of people 11 monitoring social media who knew about this --12 THE COURT: Okay. 1.3 MR. FRISCH: I'm sorry, go ahead. I think I understand the substance of 14 THE COURT: 15 it. I'm not rushing you because -- and I'm not dismissing 16 what you want to say, I want to get each thing that you think 17 is Brady. Then I'll have the Government's response. And then 18 the jury will come back. 19 The first thing is at least one or more of these 20 302s reflect that when the campaign workers tried to bring 21 these things to the attention of the higher ups in the Clinton 22 campaign, they were dismissed because they didn't think it was 23 important. 24 MR. FRISCH: Yes. 25 THE COURT: Okay. So I that's number one.

What is the next thing?

1.3

MR. FRISCH: Number two, this was so diffuse this was so -- not diffuse, this was so pervasive on so many different aspects of social media that it cuts against that this was -- let me start from the beginning.

The fact that members of the Clinton campaign knew how pervasive this was on the Internet shows that, helps the defense show, that this was not, as Mr. Microchip put it, a grand plan. It wasn't a conspiracy. It was everywhere online.

While there is some evidence that I think I opened at that certainly it was already viral, I didn't know that the Clinton campaign not only knew that but they were monitoring it.

THE COURT: Why is that exculpatory?

MR. FRISCH: It goes to whether or not this really is as, it cuts against the inference that this is so obviously a problem that it's obviously a deceptive image, that it's not just more, to use the language which is again in these 302s and I didn't even know they knew about it, stuff posting.

There is view of the world, I think in Ms. Karr's 302, that she recognized that this was part of stuff posting. It could well have been in her view, that stuff posting can be serious. But I'm entitled to probe that.

THE COURT: Why couldn't we just recall the witness

613

1 that you want to cross? What is wrong with that? Have you 2 talked to the Government about trying to stipulate to any of 3 this before we go through the parade of horribles? 4 understand your position, but have you talked to them about 5 either calling a witness, calling the witness yourself, making them available. I take it there is a fair amount of stuff in 6 7 these 302s that you wouldn't want them to testify about. A 8 lot of it is not --9 MR. FRISCH: That's one of the reasons why, Judge, 10 getting this --11 THE COURT: First just answer this question. 12 What about this could not be remedied by calling one 1.3 or more of these witnesses or having the Government call them 14 if you don't want to call them? 15 MR. FRISCH: I've already opened. This is a trial. 16 The law on --17 THE COURT: It is? 18 MR. FRISCH: Let me make my argument. You can 19 reject it, but let me make my record. Brady violations become increasingly more serious if 20 21 the timing of disclosure is after you've opened and after the 22 trial has happened. This is not a random putting stuff in 23 front of the jury. 24 Lawyers -- I know you know this, I'm just making a

record, let me just -- if I don't say this, on appeal I'll be

1 | criticized for not saying it --

THE COURT: The only thing I'll tell you is, I mean

I'm sure that the record will reflect all the basic things

there are about trials. I'm just trying to get you to

5 streamline it so I know what the argument is.

You're saying that you were hobbled in your ability to open because you weren't aware of what some of these Clinton campaign people thought. So you're saying that the point that you learned these things, that you were not in a position — you already opened and you were precluded from raising these arguments in opening. Correct?

MR. FRISCH: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. In your view, there is nothing to do at this point that could remedy that. The only solution to it is a mistrial because of what these 302s say. Do I have that right?

MR. FRISCH: Yes.

THE COURT: Then in addition to the -- I just want to make sure I understand every aspect of what your Brady claim is -- that it wasn't a big deal to the Clinton campaign, that these memes or it was so pervasive on the Internet and that the Clinton campaign was monitoring it, that that is also Brady material. Correct so far?

MR. FRISCH: Yes, with one gloss, but yes.

THE COURT: Tell me.

PROCEEDINGS

MR. FRISCH: The gloss is, our defense is that
Mr. Mackey knew that he was well known and that his purpose in
putting this out was not to deceive any voters, was precisely
to get it picked up and unnerve the Clintons. We now know
from the Clintons that they knew about this. And it
supports — they were pervasively monitoring social media and
that it supports his argument, it helps nullify the argument
that he did this in some sneaky way intending to trick voters.

They corroborate that there is this underbelly of people fighting for messaging and fighting to carry the day. That's what Mr. Mackey thought, that's what he thought he was doing. And we now know that's what the Clinton's understood what was going on. Another thing --

I'm sure you've paid much more attention to these than I have, but I thought that some of these 302s were, I think it's

Ms. Ayoubi Monett, one of them any way, talked about how everybody was so young and everybody was trying to bring this to the attention of the higher ups in the Clinton campaign, and that they were essentially rejected. That's the theme of a lot of these. I guess I'm having so much difficulty seeing how that's exculpatory.

MR. FRISCH: It's not important for the defense who in the campaign who is sufficiently perspicacious to understand what is going on in the social media. It's in the

MIT report. The fact they dropped the ball and missed this, is not on Mackey.

THE COURT: Why is it on anybody?

1.3

MR. FRISCH: Our defense is made out by these 302s. Our defense is made out, number one, it's pervasive on the Internet. The notion that you can cull out a handful of people from the Internet and say it's a conspiracy when it's all over the place, they realized that. I could cross on that.

They also realized that there is this back and forth going on in social media, whether it's Ms. Karr or Mark Elias, the Clinton campaign realizes that there is a struggle going on inside social media to control the message and carry the day. That's our defense. They corroborate that.

THE COURT: Could you call anybody else to establish that, that's less a matter of opinion rather than just looking to see what is going on on the Internet? Are there alternate sources of that position that everybody was talking about?

MR. FRISCH: It's in the MIT report, to some extent. But these are the people, these are the Clintons saying it. The people who are — the people who are most directly affected by the alleged crime here, both the voters and the people voting for Hillary Clinton. They know what is going on and they are not doing anything about it.

Which also, I know you can make the argument that

it's irrelevant, but if the people who are victimized from this, if they think it's not a big deal, whether it was or it wasn't, if they think it is not a big deal and they are not contacting Twitter, they don't think it's important to contact the Government, I can't remember which of the 302s says that.

THE COURT: I remember.

1.3

MR. FRISCH: How is it fair with all of their lawyers and election lawyers, all of their machinery, if they don't think this is so important and they are looking at 4chan, Reddit, all of these social medias and Twitter, how is it fair, how is it fair to put on Mr. Mackey criminal liability and these kind of arguments that would put the whole case in a different light had I had this information before we opened.

THE COURT: But the -- first of all, I thought the victims in this case were -- well, it's a conspiracy, but the intended victims were voters. I did not understand the claim to be that the Clinton campaign was a victim. I don't think that's what the Government has to prove in order to prove the actual charged crime. Clearly, I guess you could argue, they were affected by it.

But I do think I understand your position that there were people in the campaign that didn't think this was important enough to do anything about.

Is there another theory that you have about why this

1 is exculpatory material?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. FRISCH: Let me look at my notes.

3 THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FRISCH: This may be repetitive and forgive me.

THE COURT: It's fine.

MR. FRISCH: Just in answer to one of the things you just said. You may being right about the nature of the crime and the fact that Clinton is irrelevant, but they put it into evidence. In retrospect, they called the witness, number one.

Number two, they said -- I think this is in Karr or maybe Witt, I don't remember -- but I think someone says that they perceived this as being organic, that it organically came up in social media. It wasn't so much, some people ganging up at a ballot box in Brooklyn where they call the cops; it was just organically from social media. That also is part of our defense.

THE COURT: But that's their opinion. Right?

MR. FRISCH: Whether it's their opinion or whether they have it in a book of science, I have a right to exam it through the witness they called. And had I had all this information, you'd be darn sure I would have served a subpoena on the appropriate people on the records they were keeping, and the briefing they were having of just this stuff.

And it's not just that the voters are their purported victims, but the Clinton campaign is looking to

PROCEEDINGS

protect those voters, that is one of the jobs that

Ms. Rocketto had. To some extent they become the surrogates

for the voters. You could be sure I would have subpoenaed all

of the various records to see what exists, what other types of

records existed. This would have been a treasure trove to

hire an investigator, call these people, and find out what was

going on.

I didn't have an opportunity to do any of that because I didn't know that the Clintons were approaching what they are alleging what Mackey was doing with such thoroughness and exhaustiveness, and not doing anything about it. Whether they should or shouldn't have, the fact is they weren't.

THE COURT: Let me ask you about your opening statement. In the beginning of your opening statement you said: Memes like this were already going viral from days before. They were already going viral by the time Mr. Mackey shared the memes. The Clinton campaign had already begun taking action about these kinds of memes.

Then there is a portion where you talk about how it it was a news story, and this is later on in the opening:

About 99 percent of the approximate 4900 texts came after the media began covering the memes. And that Mr. Mackey had nothing to do with the two memes, the two clicks.

And then there is the partial quotation of his, something that he posted -- let me find it here -- it was the

1 haphazard posting.

It is certainly something that was raised in your opening statement. That's why I'm just, I just don't know why we have to go right to 11 on a mistrial and why there are not — it's always the case that if there are less drastic alternatives to a mistrial, the Court should consider them.

It seems to me, putting aside the question for the moment of whether this truly is Brady material, and I must say I have some serious questions about that, but the Government hasn't rested. We have told the jury that this is, they are expecting to stay for a little while. So the -- I'll hear from the Government on this too -- there could be a stipulation. There could be the witness could be recalled to be cross-examined about some of the things that you've raised. Or either you or the Government could call one or more of these witnesses. I don't think that any of them, the ones you're talking about, have essentially the same feature so you wouldn't want to be cumulative about it.

Why haven't you considered that? Is that something you're willing to consider if you come in second on the mistrial motion?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ FRISCH: So I'm willing to consider and think about options. I've tried to do that.

THE COURT: You propose some in your letter.

MR. FRISCH: That's right. And if your Honor --

Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 17 of 212 PageID #: 2337 PROCEEDINGS 621 1 THE COURT: You want to think about it? 2 MR. FRISCH: Can I make one more substantive point? 3 Just bear with me. 4 THE COURT: I am. Go ahead. 5 MR. FRISCH: A couple of things. 6 Number one, I've had these precise issues come up in 7 other cases where the Government's position is, you kind of 8 made that argument so why do you need this, it's cumulative, or things along those lines. And the Second Circuit has found 9 10 for the defense on precisely these kinds of issues. 11 Bear with me. One of the things that I didn't 12 realize, or never even dawned on me until I read the reports. 1.3 What I thought happened was that McNees called these out and 14 he called out on his Twitter account that Twitter had said 15 we're not going to take Mackey down, we're not going to take 16 Vaughn down. As a result, Buzzfeed wrote the first of a 17 number of articles. 18 It now appears, this is completely consistent with 19 our defense, this press: Forbes, MSBNC, CNN and others, they reported this because of the Clinton campaign. I can't say 20 21 that for sure, but it certainly reads that way. 22 That's completely what Mackey, in a way that was

completely legal, was trying to do, was create a side story. And it appears that's what happened. Let me just --

23

24

25

THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand.

1 You're saying a lot of things. I don't want to miss anything.

So your position is that efforts that certain members, it sounds like the younger people in the Clinton campaign, were very concerned by this is something that supports his claim that that's all he was trying to do, was to

MR. FRISCH: The second thing is, what I believe when I opened, was that based on the information I had, and this is based on Omar Samiri's testimony, that this had started going viral, as I believed it when I opened, two or three days before November 1st, on October 29 when people started texting the number, the short code.

rile up the Clinton campaign. All right. I get it.

In fact, according to Karr's one witness, it's not clear whether it's three or four months before, these vote by text things had been online three or four months. That is also consistent with a core part of Mr. Mackey's defense, that this was, he didn't just — he wasn't conspiring with the likes of Microchip and BakedAlaska.

He just put -- it' completely, in my view, nullifies the notion of a conspiracy. Because it shows that this was saturated online prior to October 29. And I didn't know that until I saw this.

Let me say that differently. I didn't know that the Clintons knew about it. I think we know in social media there's all kinds of stuff. The fact that the Clinton

campaign knew about it, to me, tips the scales.

THE COURT: That's the critical factor. You clearly were aware, because I think that's been your argument, that other people were pushing out these memes. So the critical factor, in your view, is that the Clinton campaign was also aware of it and either didn't react sufficiently or -- I know there is one of the 302s said that these younger people in the campaign were trying to urge senior members to use social media and they reacted by sending out mailings. But that's not what you're talking about.

You just think that if you had much more information about the inner workings of the Clinton campaign, it would assist in your defense that this wasn't a conspiracy.

MR. FRISCH: If I had any information about the inner workings of the Clinton campaign, along anything, anything. There is literally an army of people — this goes right to our defense, in fact, it is establishes our defense — there is an army, all these different sub-groups within the Clinton campaign whose responsibilities in whole or in part is to look for what was going on online for months.

For reasons various reasons, the United States

Government has decided to pick this guy and make him the

poster boy for this and call it a criminal conspiracy with the

likes of Microchip, when this is pervasive online.

And the Clinton campaign is not just an innocent

PROCEEDINGS 624 1 bystander in this. They are essentially at this trial, and 2 maybe in reality, surrogates for their voters. 3 representing the interests of their voters. If the voters are 4 the alleged, or the prospective victims of the crime -- and 5 they are -- the Clintons are standing up for them. 6 That was one of the jobs of Rocketto. That's one of 7 the reasons for all of this voter outreach and voter 8 protection that was going on in Clinton headquarters. 9 I didn't know that's what they were doing. I didn't 10 know they were aware of this for months. 11 THE COURT: I see. Let me hear from the Government. 12 MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor. First off, I think 13 your Honor has the factual chronology correct. 14 We called the 2 HFA employees, Ms. Rocketto and 15 Mr. Cotler, not to offer an opinion of what they thought of 16 this, it's because they were the two individuals who responded 17 to these particular memes and set the ball in motion such that 18 there would be a warning for them as people started seeing 19 them on the Internet. This was in the days before the 20 defendant sent it out. I think the record is clear about 21 that. 22

To the extent that they gave an opinion, it was not because they were here to say this is bad, this is good. This was to explain why they took the actions they did.

23

24

25

If we offered various other members of the campaign,

who, it sounds like your Honor read the 302s, just to state they thought this was terrible, it would have been objected to. It would be there just for opinion. There are many people in the world who have strong opinions in this case, neither side could offer those people as witnesses.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, though, to just respond specifically to the first -- go through the things that Mr. Frisch has raised.

Starting with this, I think I have this right, that this was not a big deal to the Clinton campaign, that other people were doing it, and that the Clinton campaign was monitoring it.

MR. PAULSEN: I think most of that comes from

Ms. Karr. Ms. Karr was an intern on the campaign who had a

dexterity with the dark corners of the Internet. She did spot

these things early. I think her 302 reflects she was flagging

it. She also says that she eventually got people in the

campaign to pay attention to it and do something about it,

which happens before the defendant does anything.

THE COURT: But if you could just respond to that argument that this is exculpatory material.

MR. PAULSEN: Sure. I don't know how what the campaign was doing behind the scenes could possibly be exculpatory to the defendant's intent to what he did later on. I'm struggling to figure out a way to respond to that.

We made

1 Because whether the defendant had a specific intent in what he 2 did, he would have that irrespective of what the campaign was 3 doing behind the scenes before that happened. 4 I honestly don't understand how that is related. 5 THE COURT: Let me ask you to address the second 6 basis for the application, which is that the 302s reflect that 7 this, I guess misinformation is the best way to put it, was so 8 diffuse and pervasive on the Internet -- that's the first part 9 of it, although I take it, I don't need a long answer on this, 10 I take it there are other ways to find that out. 11 It sounds like you did find them out; is that right, 12 Mr. Frisch? 1.3 MR. FRISCH: From the Clinton campaign, no. 14 THE COURT: Just the general idea, I think there has 15 been evidence about it, so I think the general idea that other 16 people were doing this is not something that you're focusing 17 on. You're focusing on the Clinton campaign's knowledge of 18 it, and reaction to it at least in one regard. Right? 19 MR. FRISCH: Yes. 20 THE COURT: So that's just the part I'm asking you 21 to respond to. 22 MR. PAULSEN: Sure, your Honor. 23 I believe Ms. Karr says that she was aware that it

was things of this sort, not this exact thing but things of

this sort, were available as of the summer of 2016.

24

1.3

that same representation in the first search warrant in this case where we said the website knowyourmemes states these first appeared in or round June 2016. Our evidence, which we presented through the summary witness yesterday, showed that the groups that the defendant was part of were discussing iterations of this scheme as early as September 26.

THE COURT: I want to -- does anyone have a copy of the search warrant application?

MR. PAULSEN: We can pull it up and e-mail it to your clerk.

THE COURT: That's great.

MR. PAULSEN: Our evidence shows that iterations of this meme was starting to be developed as early as

September 26 in groups the defendant was in. They had many,

many iterations which started in mid October, October 15 and closer to election day.

The search warrant also noted that the one that the defendant sent out was available on the Daily Stormer website, the American Nazi newspaper, as early as October 29, which is a couple days before the defendant did.

It is also true, however, that as Mr. Samiri said in his direct testimony that the precise text code didn't start registering clicks on this in any number until November 2 or so, which is around the time the defendant did it, and around the time it got picked up in the news.

I think it's a fair assumption the reason it got picked up in the news is that these things, which were pervasive in the dark corners Internet like 4chan, they were not pervasive in the "land of normies" as the defendant would call it. What called attention to this scheme such that it was covered by the Washington Post and CNN, was the break out from places like 4chan, places like the Daily Stormer, and the message group where the defendant was part of where these were formulated, was people like the defendant sending it out who had an enormous influence.

THE COURT: I think the focus of Mr. Frisch is not that these things were happening, it's that the Clinton campaign knew about it.

Do you have a response to that?

MR. PAULSEN: My reading of the 302s and the interviews I sat in, was that this particular intern saw it quite earlier than most people. That people in the campaign who were very busy obviously in the last two weeks of a campaign, some took it more seriously than others, but eventually the people in the campaign who handled text codes — that's what this scheme related to — took it seriously and acted in the days before the defendant acted. So some people took it more seriously than others, but the campaign did formally respond in late October.

THE COURT: But I'm just wondering, do you have a

response about whether the campaign's view of this is exculpatory?

1.3

3 MR. PAULSEN: I had don't see how it could be, your 4 Honor.

THE COURT: The third thing -- or one thing is that counsel says that Mr. Mackey's goal was to rile up the Clinton campaign, and these reactions are proof that the Clinton campaign was riled up.

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, part of the reason we provided the 302s we did, is that we heard his opening argument, at the same time everyone did, and he made something like that argument. We turned them over at that point because it seemed like he was interested in that.

But if his secret agenda, or so he claims, was to frustrate the Clinton campaign, that's still not relevant to the charge he's facing here. It doesn't change his intent in terms of the Government's burden here.

I don't know how that -- whether the campaign did or did not respond to his provocation would actually be exculpatory to the -- if he meant to, did it for that reason, it doesn't matter if the campaign responded. If they responded too aggressively and he didn't mean that, that wouldn't matter either. The response of the purported victim is not going to be relevant to his intent, certainly not to a degree that it's Brady material.

1.3

THE COURT: Forgive me if I don't have this exactly right. I believe, although I'm not 100 percent certain, and Mr. Frisch you can correct me, that your position is the Clinton campaign is a victim, although not for purpose of the statute, is either a victim or a surrogate for the voters who are the victims.

MR. PAULSEN: I don't believe we've taken that position, your Honor. The Clinton individuals were presented here because they are the individuals who saw this, responded to it, and set up the response such that when did people did start texting the code they would get this warning sign. They are there as part of the four-person Rocketto to Cotler to Chesley to Samiri group, that actually thwarted this, I would say. That's why they were offered.

I think you're correct that I guess because candidate Clinton was running against candidate Trump and she was affected by this, you can see her as a victim. But for the charge itself, the conspiracy against rights, is the rights of voters not the rights of a campaign.

THE COURT: All right. Then to a practical question. I know, Mr. Frisch, you think there is nothing that can cure this. Although, I have to say, I don't find that particularly persuasive. Because the Government hasn't rested, we have at least three options, four options that can address what your concerns are, putting aside the question of

1 Brady, which I'll address in a minute.

The first option, as I said, is to have the Government recall Ms. Rocketto for additional cross-examination on these topics, or the other person that

5 testified.

1.3

The second option is to make one or more of these witnesses available for Mr. Frisch to call on his direct case.

The third option is for the Government to call one or more of these witnesses as part of their case.

And the final option is for the parties to attempt to enter into some kind of a stipulation. This seems to me to be the most obvious solution. Because if the claim is that these different aspects or different members of the Clinton campaign reacted in different ways, and they don't all seem to have been united in their reaction, at least from my review of the 302s, seems to me like it's not a huge deal to craft some kind of a stipulation.

But there are these four options, even if I were to conclude that this was Brady material. Just to sort of put this in, to frame this in terms of what the Government's burden is under Brady against Maryland: That the Government has a duty to disclose all material evidence favorable to a criminal defendant. It includes not just exculpatory information but also any information that could be used to impeach Government witnesses.

Rivka Teich CSR RPR RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

And the question is, the three elements are: Whether the Government either willfully or inadvertently suppressed material information.

1.3

The second is that the information is material because it is exculpatory or because it is impeaching. And as a result, that the defendant suffers prejudice.

The first question is whether the information was suppressed. It's been turned over, and it was turned over after openings, but I guess to the extent there is a suppression argument, the claim is that it's because the information was turned over after openings and after Mr. Rocketto testified.

The second question is whether it's material. If there is a reasonable probability that if the evidence were disclosed the result would be different. This requires a prediction of whether the information has the ability to alter the outcome.

And related to the suppression issue, is the question of the Court considering the timing of the disclosure and whether the defense had a reasonable opportunity, either to use the evidence in the trial or to use information to obtain evidence for use in the trial.

So the first issue is whether this is material. And as Mr. Frisch has expressed it, it's material not because he wasn't -- let's just take -- I think the materiality questions

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: The third assertion is that since Mr.

Mackey is going to, it's his position that he only did this to
rile up the Clinton campaign, that evidence that it actually,
people were concerned about it, proves his point.

And then the other argument is that the reason why the Clinton's reaction to this or the Clinton campaign's reaction to this is because they, I think the argument is that they stand in the shoes of the victims that were perspective voters. So it's the Court's view that it's not Brady material because it amounts to really, the essence is what the Clinton campaign thought about it, and that's just not relevant. In fact, their opinion of it is no more valid than their opinion would be about whether Mr. Mackey is guilty or not. That's not relevant, to the extent that's the claim.

I do not find this issue that the Clinton campaign is somehow a surrogate for voters makes a campaign employees sense of what was happening Brady material. And then as to the question of whether Mr. Mackey riled up the Clinton campaign, I don't think that's Brady material. I think it doesn't take a huge leap of common sense to figure that something like that would rile up the Clinton campaign. But whether it did or didn't, whether it had that effect or not, is not Brady material. Beyond that, even if there were Brady material, which I find that it was not, I've already outlined the four options, and there may be more, that could be taken

ToniAnn Lucatorto RPR, RMR, CRR

1 to address Mr. Frisch's concerns.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As I said, we, the Government has not rested, the defense obviously hasn't put on a case. So those are the four things that can be done if Mr. Frisch wants to take advantage of them. And I suggest we take a little recess to discuss what those options are. And if you, you know, if you can agree on a stipulation that this was something that you know, for example, the concern that people in the Clinton campaign were concerned, some people were, that would answer the question of whether Mr. Mackey succeeded in upsetting people in the Clinton campaign or distracting them or whatever the claim was. The fact that people certain people in the Clinton campaign were aware of it, to me, seems like something that could very easily be part of the stipulation. stipulations require both sides to agree. And so if that's not a possibility and the Government is able to call some of these witnesses, or one or more of these witnesses, or recall the witness for cross examination to the extent Mr. Frisch feels that he was limited because he didn't have this information, that's another option. So we're going to take a recess for about 20 minutes and then you'll let me know what your conclusion is, okay? MR. PAULSEN: Thank you, your Honor. (A recess was taken at this time.)

ToniAnn Lucatorto RPR, RMR, CRR

(In open court.)

Just 1,	PROCEEDINGS 636
1	(JUDGE ANN DONNELLY enters the courtroom.)
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
3	THE COURT: Please be seated.
4	All right. My courtroom deputy tells me that you've
5	finished your discussion. What have we decided.
6	MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor. I believe you laid
7	out four options.
8	THE COURT: Yes.
9	MR. PAULSEN: First, recalling Ms. Rocketto, the
10	defense does not want that.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MR. PAULSEN: Option two, the defendant does not
13	want to call Ms. Rocketto.
14	THE COURT:
15	MR. PAULSEN: And third, I don't believe defendant
16	wants to call any of the other witnesses either. So we are
17	left with option four, the stipulation.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MR. PAULSEN: I'm not optimistic we will find a
20	common ground on this, but we are certainly willing to try.
21	But I think we would need the afternoon because it sounds like
22	the defense does not want to narrow the stipulation down to
23	one factor, they want a number of things from various
24	different reports. The Government is unwilling to do that
25	without proper context, so we're willing to try but I'm not, I

think we may be asking to come back tomorrow morning on the same spot.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think the stipulation needs to be done before we move on with the case because it's a stipulation. So it's both sides agreement. So obviously a stipulation requires agreement by both sides, but I just would encourage the parties to consider — I mean, it was pretty clear to me the topics that counsel wanted to include. And I'm must say, maybe it's just me, they don't strike me as particularly controversial and there could be other context that goes into that. I mean, the reason I don't think they're controversial is because I don't think it's Brady material. But I do think it's possible to craft a stipulation.

But let me just confirm with Mr. Frisch that you don't wish to have the Government recall any witnesses; is that correct?

MR. FRISCH: Correct.

THE COURT: And you don't wish to call these 302 witnesses on your own, right?

MR. FRISCH: Correct.

THE COURT: And then --

MR. PAULSEN: It was reopen cross examination.

THE COURT: You don't want to reopen the cross of Rocketto. And then, so you're going to work on a stipulation?

MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, maybe it's a triumph of hope over experience, but I think you can probably work something out.

All right. How are we on jurors?

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Judge, I'm going to have to check. They weren't all there.

THE COURT: We were missing 1 or 2, so Ms. Greene is going to check. I think next steps you're resting, the Government?

MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And then I think you said that what your preference to do in terms of motions to dismiss at the end of the case. I can't remember what you said your intended preference was. It was to do them later or to do them in writing? I don't remember.

MR. FRISCH: For now, to do a placeholder to make the motion, to treat it as having been made, and then address it or -- address it orally or brief it at a later time.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that something that you would like to just put on the record now, even though they haven't formally rested in front of the jury? That would just obviate the need to come in and go out again.

MR. FRISCH: I can do that. And the other thing is that yesterday your Honor inquired as to the defense reference with regard to the striking of that exhibit.

THE COURT: Right.

PROCEEDINGS 639 1 MR. FRISCH: And the instruction on anonymity, and I 2 would ask that you do that sooner as opposed -- you do it 3 today. 4 THE COURT: Oh, to strike that --5 MR. FRISCH: Exhibit and to give the instruction on 6 anonymity. 7 THE COURT: I thought that was what your wanted on 8 the final charge. 9 MR. PAULSEN: That's for the jury charge. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. FRISCH: I never answered. 12 THE COURT: I never proposed that. You want me to 13 give a freestanding anonymity charge? MR. FRISCH: Well, my first preference is to strike 14 15 it, tell the jury to strike it, and to give the freestanding 16 anonymity charge. And if you don't want to do that, just 17 strike the exhibit for now and do the charge. 18 THE COURT: I think that's the best way to do it. I 19 apologize, I misunderstood what your were asking me to do, I 20 forgot they were connected. So it's Mr. Feldman, right? 21 MR. FRISCH: Right. 22 THE COURT: And I'm sort of free styling here. 23 During his testimony, what's the exhibit number?

THE COURT: Okay. So Exhibit 712, which was a

MR. PAULSEN: 712.

24

PROCEEDINGS 640 1 photograph. Do you want me to describe it? 2 MR. FRISCH: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Okay. A photograph of Mr. Mackey's 4 profile. How do you describe it? In shadow or something. 5 MR. FRISCH: The profile photograph. 6 MR. PAULSEN: Silhouette. 7 THE COURT: Silhouette. So what I'm going to say is 8 during Mr. Feldman's testimony, Exhibit Number 712 came into 9 evidence and it's a photograph of Mr. Mackey's profile in 10 silhouette. And that I am striking that from the record and any testimony about that exhibit. And so you won't be 11 12 considering it. How's that? 13 MR. FRISCH: Good. 14 THE COURT: Good? All right. And then how do you 15 want to do this. We have the jury ready. Do you want to make 16 your motion? 17 I can just repeat what I said a moment MR. FRISCH: 18 ago. With the Government about to rest and to, for the jury 19 and the Court's convenience, in anticipation of the Government 20 about to rest, I make my Rule 29 motion for the Government's 21 failure to make its case and I ask permission to either orally 22 argue it or brief it within the near future at a date to be 23 decided. Later on today or perhaps tomorrow. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to respond,

25

placeholder wise?

Mackey - Direct - Frisch 641 1 MR. PAULSEN: Just a placeholder response. 2 oppose the motion and will do it in writing. If he presents a 3 motion in writing, we will respond. 4 THE COURT: All right. So at this point, the 5 motion is denied with leave to supplement. And then I'll consider it at a later date. 6 7 All right. With that, I think we are ready for the 8 jury; is that right? 9 MR. FRISCH: Correct. 10 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, there was one other 11 motion the defendant made yesterday that I think he postponed 12 until now as well regarding the admissibility of the 13 coconspirator statements. Do you want to handle that at a 14 different time? 15 THE COURT: Oh. Well, we might as well handle it 16 What's your position? now. 17 MR. PAULSEN: We believe that we have laid a proper 18 foundation linking the various statements to a common 19 conspiracy. I'm happy to address it in detail. I'm prepared 20 to do so if your Honor wishes. 21 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 22 23 THE COURT: Do you have more that you want to say at this point or do you want to incorporate that in your motions. 24 25 MR. FRISCH: The latter.

```
Mackey - Direct - Frisch
                                                             642
 1
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. So the motion is denied at this
 2
     point, again, with leave to supplement at a later date.
 3
               All right, let's get the jury.
               (Jury enters the courtroom.)
 5
               THE COURT: All right, good afternoon everybody.
 6
     Nice to see you again. We are ready to continue with the
 7
     trial.
 8
               Let me ask the Government. Do you have any further
 9
     evidence to put on.
10
               MR. PAULSEN: We do not, your Honor. The Government
11
     rests.
12
               THE COURT: Mr. Frisch, do you wish to put on any
13
     evidence?
               MR. FRISCH: I do, your Honor. I call Mr. Mackey.
14
15
               (Witness takes the witness stand.)
16
     DOUGLASS MACKEY, called as a witness, having been first duly
17
     sworn/affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Mackey, I know you heard me
18
19
     give this instruction to other witnesses, but it's important
20
     that you follow it, too. Please don't speak too quickly so we
21
     don't make it too difficult for the court reporter.
22
               If there's a question that isn't clear or you want
23
     to have repeated, let me know. And just do your best to
     answer only the question you're being asked, all right?
24
25
               THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.
```

- 1 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
- 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 3 BY MR. FRISCH:
- 4 Q Mr. Mackey, good afternoon.
- 5 A Good afternoon.
- 6 Q On January 27, 2021, where were you living?
- 7 A I was living in Florida.
- 8 Q And as of January 27, 2021 for how long had you lived in
- 9 Florida?
- 10 A Almost three years.
- 11 Q With whom were you living in 2021 in January?
- 12 A I was living with two roommates.
- THE COURT: Mr. Frisch, I'm so sorry. I neglected
- 14 to give that instruction. Can I do that at this point? You
- 15 said you wanted it done.
- 16 MR. FRISCH: Oh, I beg your pardon. I forgot it
- 17 too.
- THE COURT: So sorry about this folks, this is my
- 19 fault. There was a witness who testified, Mr. Loren Feldman,
- 20 and during his testimony, an exhibit, which was 712 it was a
- 21 photograph of Mr. Mackey's profile silhouette. I'm striking
- 22 that exhibit so you won't, it won't be part of your
- 23 deliberations, okay? So I'm sorry that I didn't do that
- 24 first. Go ahead.
- MR. FRISCH: Thank you.

- 1 Q So as of January 2021, with whom were you living?
- 2 A I was living with two roommates.
- 3 Q And did you and your two roommates live in a house or an
- 4 apartment in Florida?
- 5 A We lived in an apartment building.
- 6 Q That morning at about 7: 00 a.m., what happened?
- 7 A We received a knock at the door they said it was the FBI.
- 8 Q Had you been sleeping or were you awake at that time?
- 9 A I was asleep at the time.
- 10 Q And did the FBI explain why they were there?
- 11 A They said that they had an arrest warrant.
- 12 Q For?
- 13 A For me.
- 14 Q In total, about how many law enforcement officers were at
- 15 your apartment that morning, approximately?
- 16 A There was about 8 to 10.
- 17 Q Did they say why they were there to arrest you?
- 18 A They didn't say. I asked what for and they didn't say.
- 19 Q Before January 27, 2021, had you ever been arrested?
- 20 A No.
- 21 Q Have you before arrest since?
- 22 A No, I haven't.
- 23 Q After the agents and the officers arrested you, did they
- 24 take you someplace?
- 25 A Yes, they did.

- 1 Q Where to?
- 2 A They took me to the federal courthouse in West Palm
- 3 Beach.
- 4 Q Before you arrived at the courthouse before you appeared
- 5 before a judge, had anyone told you why you were under arrest?
- 6 A No.
- 7 Q During your trip to the courthouse, did you think that
- 8 you were under arrest for sharing the memes about vote-to-text
- 9 that this jury has seen?
- 10 A No. I had no idea why I was under arrest.
- 11 Q Did it even enter your mind that you were arrested in
- 12 | connection with the memes that the jury has seen?
- 13 A No.
- 14 Q Were there agents -- did the 8 to 10 law enforcement
- officers include FBI agents from New York?
- 16 A Yes, they did.
- 17 Q And do you know the names of any of the agents that were
- 18 from New York who were there?
- 19 A Just one of them. Maegan Rees.
- 20 Q Did you come later that day at or after the time you were
- 21 before the judge to see the criminal complaint underlying the
- 22 warrant for your arrest?
- 23 A Yes. It was after I saw the judge.
- 24 Q And who swore out the complaint?
- 25 A It was Maegan Rees.

- Q Was the entirety of your contact with him online?
- 22 A Yes it was.
- 23 Q Back in 2016, did you believe you had anything in common
- 24 with him?
- 25 A Just the fact that we both supported Donald Trump.

- 1 Q Other than that, did you have any idea what was going on
- 2 in his head?
- 3 A No, I had no idea.
- 4 Q Regarding people alleged in this case as coconspirators,
- 5 did you ever meet any of them?
- 6 A No, I never met any of them.
- 7 Q Did you ever speak to any of them by telephone?
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q On the Government 's case it presented 2 memes suggesting
- 10 vote-to-text. I believe it's Government Exhibit 720 and 721.
- Where did you find those?
- 12 A I found those memes or 4chan.
- 13 Q What's 4chan?
- 14 A It's an internet messaging board.
- 15 Q At any one time back in 2016, how many users were on
- 16 4chan?
- 17 A I don't know exactly how many. Probably was thousands
- 18 tens of thousands. I'm not really sure.
- 19 Q Can you give us a sense of how does 4chan work? When you
- open the 4chan program, whatever the right word to use; open,
- 21 access it, activate it, what do you see? What's there?
- 22 A They have different boards that you can click on and
- 23 within each board, there 's different threads that you can
- 24 click on. If you go under the thread, then people make posts
- 25 which consist of images and texts or both.

- 1 Q So when you say a board or a thread, is that by topic?
- 2 A Yes. It's organized by topic.
- 3 Q Exhibit -- Government Exhibit 720 and 721, did you share
- 4 those two memes late on November 1 st or --
- 5 MR. FRISCH: Withdrawn.
- 6 Q On November 1st or late that night?
- 7 A Yes, I did.
- 8 Q Mr. Mackey, did you share those two memes intending to
- 9 trick anyone about voting?
- 10 A No, I did not.
- 11 Q The Government also showed the jury Government
- 12 Exhibit 722. Do you recall seeing that on or about November
- 13 2, 2016?
- 14 A Yes, I do.
- 15 Q And how did you come to see it?
- 16 A The Twitter user @nia4_Trump mentioned me. So when you
- 17 get a mention, it shows up in your notifications. So when I
- 18 saw it in my notifications, I retweeted it.
- 19 Q Can you explain what you mean by the person mentioning
- 20 you?
- 21 A They wrote out the handle, which is at, followed by my
- 22 handle.
- 23 Q So if someone tweets on -- if someone tweets something
- 24 that has your handle it in, you automatically are notified of
- 25 it?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q And upon being receiving that notification of 722, you
- 3 retweeted it?
- 4 A Yes, I did.
- 5 Q Did you share or --
- 6 MR. FRISCH: Withdrawn.
- 7 Q Did you retweet that meme with intent to trick anyone
- 8 about voting?
- 9 A No, I did not.
- 10 Q Now, I think yesterday, maybe it was the day before, I
- 11 think it was yesterday, the Government showed the jury chats
- 12 and messages among other people online discussing vote-by-text
- memes in 2016. Do you recall seeing those chats and messages
- 14 in this courtroom?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q Before you shared or retweeted the three memes that we
- just talked about, had you seen those chats and messages that
- 18 the Government showed the jury?
- 19 A No, I had not.
- 20 Q When was the first time you saw them?
- 21 A The first time I saw them was when the Government
- 22 provided us with the evidence that they held.
- 23 Q And that means after you were arrested and after this
- 24 prosecution began, correct?
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q And the Government has an obligation to provide the
- 2 defense with its evidence, and that's when you saw it?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Did you share any memes with intent to threaten anyone's
- 5 | right to vote?
- 6 A No, I did not.
- 7 Q To intimidate anyone's right to vote?
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q To oppress anyone's right to vote?
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q To injure anyone's right to vote?
- 12 A No.
- 13 Q Have you ever been affiliated with any political
- 14 organization?
- 15 A No, I have not.
- 16 Q Did anyone ever employ you to be Ricky Vaughn on Twitter?
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q Did anyone ever pay you to be Ricky Vaughn on Twitter?
- 19 A No.
- 20 Q Mr. Mackey, where were you born?
- 21 A I was born in Washington, D.C.
- 22 Q How old are you now?
- 23 A I'm 33 years old.
- Q What kind of work did your father do when you were born?
- 25 A He was working for a senator in D.C.

25 Q What kind of business was Dunham?

22

23

Yes.

For what period of time did you work for Dunham?

- 1 A He was in the business of economics consulting.
- 2 Q And in the office in which you worked, how many people
- 3 worked in the office where you were?
- 4 A About ten.
- 5 Q What was your job?
- 6 A I was an economics analyst.
- 7 Q You said you worked there, you said June of 2016?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q What happened then?
- 10 A Basically I was let go. We came to an agreement that
- 11 they would give me several months pay and we would part ways,
- 12 so I agreed to that.
- 13 Q Where were Dunham's offices?
- 14 A Over here on Court Street.
- 15 Q In Brooklyn?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q About -- and you said --
- MR. FRISCH: Withdrawn.
- 19 Q So you left Dunham in the June of 2016 period?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q That was before the period of the charged conspiracy in
- 22 this case; which is September to November 2016, correct?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q During the period of the charged conspiracy in this case,
- 25 September to November 2016, did you work at Dunham?

- 1 A No.
- 2 Q Did you live in this district?
- 3 A No, I did not.
- 4 Q Where did you live?
- 5 A I was living in Manhattan.
- 6 Q During the period of the charged conspiracy in this
- 7 case, did you post anything online from this district, the
- 8 Eastern District of New York?
- 9 A No.
- 10 Q When you started your Twitter account, did you say 2014 ?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q How old were you?
- 13 A I was about 24 years old.
- 14 Q How did you choose the name Ricky Vaughn?
- 15 A I just chose it randomly because I enjoined the movie
- 16 Major League.
- 17 Q And Ricky Vaughn was a fictional character in the movie?
- 18 A Yes. Played by Charlie Sheen.
- 19 Q Did he have a nickname?
- 20 A Yes. His nickname was The Wild Thing.
- 21 Q Did you have what they call a Twitter avatar?
- 22 A Yes, I did.
- Q What was your avatar?
- 24 A It was a picture of Charlie Sheen wearing a red MAGA cap.
- 25 Q And I think we've seen this, I think the jury has seen

- 1 this, but your Twitter avatar appeared in the upper left
- 2 corner of your tweets. Essentially a photograph of Charlie
- 3 Sheen wearing a red MAGA cap; is that right?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q Can you say exactly in total how many tweets and messages
- 6 you sent as Ricky Vaughn between 2014 and 2016?
- 7 A No, not exactly.
- 8 | Q Can you approximate it?
- 9 A It would have to be hundreds of thousands. I'm not
- 10 exactly sure how many.
- 11 Q What's a chat group on Twitter?
- 12 A A chat group is a private message group between three or
- 13 more Twitter users.
- 14 Q How many people could be -- so three or more is the
- 15 minimum. How many could be in a chat group?
- 16 A I think it was up to 50 or so.
- 17 Q Did you join chat groups on Twitter?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q About how many?
- 20 A Dozens. I'm not sure exactly how many.
- 21 Q Did you post memes on Twitter?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q In 2015 and 2016, how often did you use Twitter?
- 24 A I used Twitter every day.
- 25 Q How often did you tweet or retweet or share memes?

- 1 A Every day.
- 2 Q How many times a day?
- 3 A Typically hundreds of times per day.
- 4 Q Did you use your real name on your Ricky Vaughn account?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q Did you remain anonymous with regard to your name?
- 7 A Yes, I did.
- 8 Q Was there a reason for that?
- 9 A Just because it's online. And I think when it's a First
- 10 Amendment issue, sometimes anonymity might be better.
- 11 Q Now, the Government showed the jury things from Twitter,
- 12 | correct? You saw the things that were shown, correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q Was Twitter the only place that content about the
- 15 presidential election appeared in 2016?
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q What are some of the other places where it appeared?
- 18 A Everywhere online. It would be Facebook, Reddit, 4chan.
- 19 Mainstream media sources, everywhere.
- 20 Q So you told us about 4chan. What's Reddit? And that's
- 21 R-E -D-D-I- T. What's Reddit?
- 22 A That's -- it 's like a text discussion board, mostly
- 23 with, like, they have a lot of threads where people can write
- 24 messages and respond back and forth.
- 25 THE COURT: Can I just -- I just wanted to clarify.

I don't know. Millions maybe.

Did you consider Twitter to be a reliable source of information?

23 Α No.

21

22

24 Q Why not?

25 Well, I think there was all kinds of stuff on Twitter.

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE

1 (Sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: What's your objection?

MR. PAULSEN: So shortly after the defendant was arrested, one of the things that popped up was people went around and looked for other examples of people like this, and they found this woman that did something comparable on the other side trying to promote. And it was /TKPWEPBL it's because this woman didn't get arrest, why exactly did Mr. Mackey get arrested, I'm assuming that's where is he going.

MR. FRISCH: That is incorrect. We found this on Twitter within the last month, it's still up. And it, that's reason enough to put it on about Twitter's, all the testimony about how serious this is and Twitter has taken it off and now you've got — this kind of stuff is all over Twitter and I think this goes, this undermines the Government's argument, the Government's theory of prosecution in a number of ways.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I mean, if we were talking about a bank robbery and there was — the defendant was on trial for bank robbery, I know we wouldn't permit other examples of bank robberies to show that other people were doing this. That's not your intent, correct?

MR. FRISCH: That is right.

THE COURT: But forgive me for being dense, but the fact that it was on the internet, it's unrelated to him. Why is it relevant and it's November 8th.

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 659 1 MR. FRISCH: No, it's March 2, 2023, that's when it 2 was posted. It's still up. It was posted on Election Day and 3 it's sill still up. That's the argument. 4 THE COURT: I see. I quess that's an argument you 5 can rebut. I guess the argument then is, you know, Twitter is 6 not, the police aren't working well enough, they aren't 7 solving other --MR. FRISCH: That's his argument and my argument --8 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, he can't just decide to 9 10 pluck other things and say you arrested my guy. 11 MR. FRISCH: That's not my argument. 12 THE COURT: He's not going to say that and I'm not 13 going to permit that. One of the arguments this morning was 14 this is all over the place and that's what you opened on. But 15 I know you're not going to make an argument about why didn't 16 they arrest this person. And if you want to make an argument 17 that Twitter didn't go a good job of policing, you can 18 respond, okay? 19 MR. FRISCH: Thank you, your Honor. 20 (Continued on the next page.) 21 22

23

24

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 57 of 212 PageID #: 2377 D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 661 1 (In open court.) 2 THE COURT: The objection is overruled go ahead. 3 BY MR. FRISCH: I'm going to put this on just for the witness to look at 5 and see if he can identify it. 6 Mr. Mackey, can you identify that? 7 Yes, I can. What is it? 8 It's a tweet from a democratic comedian named 9 10 Ms. Christina Wong. She says --11 Before you testify, we have to get it into evidence 12 first. 1.3 Got it. Yes, I recognize it. 14 Did you see this on Twitter? 15 Α Yes. 16 When did you see it on Twitter most recently? 17 Α March 2. 18 THE COURT: Of this year? 19 Of 2023? 20 March 2 of 2023. 21 MR. FRISCH: I offer it. 22 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, subject to the Government's previous objection. 23 24 THE COURT: It's in evidence. 25 (Defense Exhibit C, was received in evidence.)

- 1 BY MR. FRISCH:
- 2 Q Again, I think on the upper part of this, I'm not sure
- 3 the jury can see it but, you see the date March 2, 2023, when
- 4 you saw this on Twitter, correct?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q It shows on the bottom that it was posted November 8,
- 7 2016. Do you see that?
- 8 A Yes, I do.
- 9 Q Thank you. One of the things in evidence, and I believe
- 10 it's a Government Exhibit, the MIT research report about which
- 11 Dr. Chu and Mr. Powers testified. Do you recall that?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Did you see the MIT study at the time when it came out on
- 14 February 23, 2016?
- 15 A I don't think it was right away, but I saw it shortly
- 16 thereafter.
- 17 Q In February or March 2016; is that fair?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Ms. Parshad, I don't remember the exhibit number, if you
- 20 could call it up. Thank you. If you could enlarge the bottom
- 21 part of the first page.
- Your Honor, with the Court's permission this will be
- 23 the only exhibit I'm going to do this, I'm going to ask
- 24 Mr. Mackey to read aloud two very short portions of this.
- THE COURT: That's fine.

- 1 Q Could you read, if you can see it, I'm going to ask you
- 2 to read the short amount of text on the bottom.
- 3 A Sure: With super Tuesday just around the corner we know
- 4 one thing about this election, the most riveting in years.
- 5 But why?
- I can't read that.
- Why is this election different from everything that
- 8 came before.
- 9 Q Ms. Parshad, if you could go to the top of the next page.
- 10 The top paragraph, Mr. Mackey, can you see that okay?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Read that top paragraph.
- 13 A The obvious answer is the surprising lineup of final
- 14 | contenders. A year ago the idea that a Donald Trump or a
- 15 Bernie Sanders could have a serious shot at the White House
- 16 was unthinkable, especially to the quote "experts" working off
- 17 20th Century playbooks. Now here we are and the real question
- 18 is how the dynamics of public opinion, and influence in
- 19 particular, have changed to make this new kind of politics
- 20 possible.
- 21 Q Finally, if you could go, Ms. Parshad, the very bottom of
- 22 that page.
- 23 If you could just read that?
- 24 A In short, the old influence hierarchy has been shattered,
- 25 replaced by a new mosaic of influence in which social media

Do you recall the names at least of some the publications

24

25

Α

Yes.

- D. MACKEY DIRECT MR. FRISCH 665
- 1 that wrote articles about you in 2016 before the election?
- 2 A From what I recall: Washington Post, Vice, Magazine,
- 3 Tablet Magazine. There might have been others.
- 4 Q Did you ever hear the term the deplorable free speech
- 5 activist?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q What does that mean to you?
- 8 A A term that I used, ironically, in my biography of my
- 9 Twitter account.
- 10 Q If anyone looked at your Twitter bio, that's what they
- 11 would see?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Do you recall in 2016 whether any celebrities or
- 14 | well-known people retweeted you?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q Can you give some examples that you recall?
- 17 A I recall Lou Dobbs and Rosanne Barr. Those are the ones
- 18 I remember.
- 19 Q Who is Lou Dobbs?
- 20 A He's used to be a television personality.
- 21 Q Did you consider yourself -- I think there was a chat to
- 22 this affect -- did you consider yourself, as a result of all
- of this, a leader of sorts?
- 24 A Yes, I did.
- 25 Q I want to ask you, change the subject, I want to ask you

- 1 | a question about what I said in opening statement, something
- 2 | we call stuff posting. I'm going to continue to call it that
- 3 | so it's not to unnecessarily use offensive language. Fair to
- 4 say you used language and said things as Rickey Vaughn that
- 5 were profane or were profanity?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Fair to say you used language and said things online that
- 8 were offensive.
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q In bad taste?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And sometimes crossed the lines of decency?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q You don't dispute any of that, correct?
- 15 A No, I don't dispute that.
- 16 Q This term stuff posting, did you create the term?
- 17 A No.
- THE COURT: Just to be clear, that's not what it's
- 19 called, right? You're trying to be polite.
- MR. FRISCH: Yes.
- 21 Q You did not create this term?
- 22 A No.
- Q Was it essentially a Twitter term of art?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And what is your understanding of what that means?

- 1 A To me it just meant posting a lot of stuff, just kind of
- 2 distract or get the conversation going, that kind of thing.
- 3 Q In 2016, were you the only person stuff posting on the
- 4 Internet?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q Any idea how many other people were the doing the same
- 7 thing?
- 8 A Thousands, millions, I don't know how many exactly.
- 9 Q Was there a lot of content online from people stuff
- 10 posting?
- 11 A Yes, there was.
- 12 Q Was there other content online about voting by text?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q We saw in discovery -- rather, the jury saw on the chats,
- some other terms of art I want to talk to you about those, see
- 16 | if you know what they are.
- 17 I'm being polite, is there a term of art stuff Lord?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And is that a term that you coined?
- 20 A No, it's not.
- 21 Q Is it essentially an Internet term of art or was it an
- 22 Internet term of art?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q What do you understand that it means, stuff Lord?
- 25 A Just someone who is stuff posts I suppose.

- D. MACKEY DIRECT MR. FRISCH 668
- 1 Q So essentially you would have been a stuff Lord, correct?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q Were you the only stuff Lord in 2016?
- 4 A No.
- 5 Q You were one of many, many people doing that sort of
- 6 stuff, correct?
- 7 A Correct.
- 8 Q Another term that was in the Government's evidence was
- 9 stuff lib, I'm being polite. Did you coin that term?
- 10 A No, I didn't.
- 11 Q Was that also a term that was used on the Internet?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q What is your understanding of what that term meant?
- 14 A A derogatory term for a liberal.
- 15 Q Was there also online derogatory terms for conservatives?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q I think yesterday, the day before, we saw a reference to
- 18 the word normie, is that a term that you coined?
- 19 A No.
- 20 Q Was it also a term of art or at least an Internet term of
- 21 art?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Was is a normie?
- 24 A I think it's just someone who isn't really up to speed on
- Internet lingo, doesn't spend a lot of time on social media,

- 1 that kind of thing.
- 2 Q From your own knowledge and experience, were you familiar
- 3 in 2016 with any history in the United States about political
- 4 campaigns and how they are typically run?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q Explain.
- 7 A For as long as it's been around, it's been very ruckus, I
- 8 | suppose. They are always lying about each other.
- 9 Q What do you mean by that?
- 10 A The politicians are always lying about their opposition.
- 11 Q And the campaigns?
- 12 A Yes, I think so.
- 13 Q So this didn't start, this kind of back and forth, didn't
- 14 start with the presidential election campaign in 2016,
- 15 correct?
- 16 A No, it didn't.
- 17 Q What was different was that it was on social media?
- 18 A Yes, I think so.
- 19 Q I want to talk about chat rooms. When Agent Cunder was
- 20 | testifying, Mr. Paulsen asked a number of questions about
- 21 whether you were in various groups or chat rooms at various
- 22 times. Do you recall that testimony?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q I want to focus on use of the word "in" in those
- 25 questions.

- 1 How many different groups or chat rooms were you a
- 2 member in 2016?
- 3 A I don't recall exactly, but it was a lot. It was dozens
- 4 or more than that, I'm not sure exactly.
- 5 Q In every group or chat room of which you were a member,
- 6 did you read every chat and every message of those rooms and
- 7 groups of which you were a member?
- 8 A No. I think I would have been doing that all day if I
- 9 read every message.
- 10 Q If you were in such a room; that is, if you were a member
- or sometimes participated, did you have knowledge of
- 12 everything that other participants were saying?
- 13 A No.
- 14 Q Did you ever photoshop anything by yourself or do it
- 15 yourself?
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q Did you sometimes ask others to photoshop for you?
- 18 A Yes, from time to time.
- 19 Q Even if you did not ask people to photoshop things for --
- 20 | even if you asked people to photoshop things for you, did you
- 21 share things online that had been photoshopped by other
- 22 people?
- 23 A That other people had photoshopped?
- 24 Q Correct.
- 25 A Yes, I did share stuff that other people had

women should register for the draft. So I disagree with that

- 1 politically.
- 2 Q And, therefore, so what was your intent in sharing these
- 3 memes?
- 4 A To call attention to her position, which is that she
- 5 wants or wanted to draft women into the draft, therefore,
- 6 maybe she would send them overseas to fight.
- 7 Q What was your intent in sharing photoshopped pop stars
- 8 | wearing MAGA Karrs?
- 9 A A stuff post. It was something to distract, might rile
- 10 up Twitter, might rile up who knows, the Hillary Clinton
- 11 campaign or supporters, something like that.
- 12 Q When you were Ricky Vaughn on Twitter, did you sometimes
- 13 use terms of art that you understood were used by the
- 14 campaigns themselves?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q So one of them was "turnout," you talked about voter
- 17 turnout, correct?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q What is your understanding of turnout in connection with
- 20 presidential elections?
- 21 A So my understanding is that turnout is one of the most
- 22 important things for the campaigns. If their voters don't
- 23 turnout or their voters turnout a lot, it determines whether
- 24 they win or lose.
- 25 Q Is that unusual for political campaigns to be concerned

- 1 | about turnout?
- 2 A No. I think that's one of the things that they usually
- 3 spend time talking about.
- 4 Q That's both getting their own voters to turnout, and
- 5 discouraging the voters of the other side from turning out; is
- 6 that correct?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Increasing the turnout of your voters, correct?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Was it unusual, in your experience and from your
- 11 knowledge and your understanding, to take steps to demoralize
- 12 the opponent's voters?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q It's not unusual, correct?
- 15 A It's not unusual.
- 16 Q Both sides do it, correct?
- 17 A I've seen both sides doing it, yes.
- 18 Q In one of the posts that we saw, one of the chats or
- 19 messages that we saw, you made a reference to low information
- 20 voters. Do you recall that?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Before I ask you what that means, and what you meant by
- 23 it, do you recall when in the calendar year of 2016 you used
- 24 that phrase?
- 25 A I don't remember exactly, but it might have been the

- 1 first half of the year.
- 2 Q In any event, the exhibit is in evidence and we can look
- 3 at it. What did you mean by low information voters?
- 4 A A term is thrown around on the media, people not paying
- 5 close attention to politics, they don't know a lot about the
- 6 candidates, the issues, et cetera.
- 7 Q That's both sides of the political spectrum?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q I should say all sides of the political spectrum,
- 10 correct?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Low information voters across the political ideological
- 13 range, correct?
- 14 THE COURT: Mr. Frisch, could you please not lead
- 15 your witness.
- MR. FRISCH: Of course.
- 17 Q What did you mean by it?
- 18 A I believe that there are low information voters across
- 19 the political spectrum.
- 20 Q Thank you. You also talked about, I think on a number of
- 21 occasions, the election being on a knife's edge. Do you
- 22 recall that?
- 23 A Yes, I do.
- Q What did you mean by that?
- 25 A Well, I think it was close in the electoral college. And

- 19 Q What was your intent on retweeting this?
- 20 A It's a stuff post. To me this is, I wouldn't think
- 21 anyone would take this seriously. I thougt it was funny.
- 22 Q When you retweeted it, did you retweet it with the name
- 23 Ricky Vaughn at the top?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q So anyone who would see this retweet would have seen your

- D. MACKEY DIRECT MR. FRISCH 676
- 1 | name Ricky Vaughn at the top, correct?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And the red MAGA cap on the figure on the upper left?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q By the way, the Government showed Agent Cunder a meme of
- 6 someone named I think Aziz Ansari holding a sign about voting
- 7 by text. Do you remember seeing that?
- 8 A I don't recall seeing that.
- 9 Q Do you recall seeing it two days ago?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Did you see it at the time?
- 12 A I don't recall.
- 13 Q Who is Aziz Ansari?
- 14 A A stand-up comedian.
- 15 Q Did you have any reaction upon -- or don't recall if you
- 16 saw it in 2016, correct?
- 17 Q You saw in discovery in this case, correct?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Did you have any reaction upon seeing it?
- 20 A It looks silly to me.
- 21 Q Now, let me ask Ms. Parshad to call up, if you could call
- 22 up 200-73 and 200-74. We'll do each at a time, start with
- 23 200-73.
- MR. FRISCH: One moment, your Honor, apparently they
- 25 are in evidence under a different number.

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 73 of 212 PageID #: 2393 D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 677 1 THE COURT: Sure. 2 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, he has an older version 3 we're just trying to match it up. 4 THE COURT: It's all right. 5 MR. FRISCH: I'm going to move on to something else; 6 apparently these didn't come into evidence. 7 THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. FRISCH: 8 9 Can we turn to 410-11. While Ms. Parshad is looking for 10 that, did the sharing of the memes on November 1st into 11 November 2, 2016 cause publicity, result in publicity? 12 The two memes? 1.3 Yes. Q 14 Yes. 15 So now I want to go back to October 30, 2016. You posted 16 your first one on November 1st, 2016, correct? 17 Α Yes. 18 So the chat that's on the screen, which is 410-11, did 19 you see, do you recall seeing this at the time? 20 Α This chat? 21 Correct. 22 No. 23 You're familiar, however, as you've testified, with the 24 DraftOurDaughters type memes, correct? 25 Yes.

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 74 of 212 PageID #: 2394 D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 678 1 So if you look at the line underneath it, it says: And 2 Buzzfeed took the bait. LOLOLOL. Do you see that? 3 I do. LOL, essentially laugh out loud, correct? 5 Yes. 6 In the context of this world with which you were 7 familiar, what does that mean: Buzzfeed took the bait LOLOLOL? 8 9 MR. PAULSEN: Objection, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Sustained. 11 Was one of the purposes of sharing the memes to get 12 publicity? 1.3 Yes. 14 Do you recall the publications that published stories about the memes on November 2 and thereafter? 15 Are you referring to the DraftOurDaughters memes or the 16 17 later memes? 18 Later memes. 19 Mashable, Buzzfeed, Wired, CNN. I think there were 20 others. 21 If we could turn to 410-20. If you highlight the top 22 portion. Do you see that reference there to CTR?

Do you know what that stands for?

23

24

25

Α

Yes.

I do, yes.

- D. MACKEY DIRECT MR. FRISCH 679
- 1 | Q What does it stand for?
- 2 A Correct The Record.
- 3 Q In the context of this meme, do you know what CTR means,
- 4 or what Correct The Record is?
- 5 A Yes, I do.
- 6 Q Explain?
- 7 A Correct The Record was a Hillary Clinton super pack that
- 8 was essentially her online troll army. They would go around
- 9 | commenting on posts, replying to posts, that kind of thing.
- 10 Q Do you recall the testimony of Omar Samiri on the
- 11 Government's case?
- 12 A Yes, I do.
- 13 Q Do you recall the spreadsheets that the Government
- 14 | introduced into evidence through him?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 O And what was your understanding or what is your
- 17 understanding of those spreadsheets; that is, generally
- 18 | speaking, what do those spreadsheets show?
- 19 A They showed that people started texting the number on
- October 29, that it was less than 100 people texted the people
- 21 before I posted the two memes. After I posted the two memes,
- roughly about 100 more people texted the number. And then the
- 23 story was picked up by Robert McNees and later Buzzfeed, Wired
- 24 Mashable, et cetera, at which point about 4,800 more people
- 25 texted the number.

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 76 of 212 PageID #: 2396 D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 680 1 Your testimony is based on your review of the 2 spreadsheets about which Mr. Samiri testified about, correct? 3 Yes. 4 THE COURT: Let's not lead the witness. 5 Q What was your -- I don't mean to. 6 So the record is clear, the testimony you just gave, 7 what is it based on? 8 Based on the spreadsheet that the Government provided to us that were created by Omar Samiri. 10 Thank you, Mr. Mackey. 11 Ms. Parshad would you call up 400-41. 12 Did you participate in this chat? 13 Yes, I did. 14 Do you see the bottom where it says: Return of RV. 15 above: The return of RV? 16 Α Yes. 17 That's you? Q 18 Yes. 19 Do you see where it says: Voter misinformation LOL? 20 Α Yes. 21 Then the next one says: Ricky? 22 Α Yes. 23 Next one says: Ha ha ha so awesome? 24 Α Yes. 25 Then you say: LOLOLOL, correct?

D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 681

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q Can you explain this and why you wrote what you did?
- 3 A Yes. So we were discussing that the media had picked up
- 4 the story and they were calling it voter misinformation. And
- 5 I said LOL, because I thought it was funny that the media
- 6 thought that this was an attempt to deceive voters, not just a
- 7 | ridiculous post that no one would possibly believe that you
- 8 could text by vote.
- 9 Q Thank you, Ms. Parshad.
- Do you recall, are you able to say approximately
- 11 what dates and times that you shared the two memes that are
- 12 Government Exhibit 720 and 721?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 O Tell us.
- 15 A The first one was on November 1st approximately five or
- 16 5:30 p.m. The second one was on November 2, just after
- 17 midnight around 12:30 a.m. eastern time.
- 18 Q From the time that you -- where did you see these memes?
- 19 A I saw these memes on the messaging board 4chan.
- 20 Q From the time that you saw these two memes on 4chan until
- 21 the time that you shared them, how long did that take?
- 22 A It was a split second. I just copied and pasted it from
- 23 4chan over to Twitter.
- Q Did you deliberate about doing so before you did it?
- 25 A No, I didn't.

- D. MACKEY DIRECT MR. FRISCH 682
- 1 Q Discuss it with anyone before sharing them?
- 2 A No, I did not.
- 3 Q Were you posting other things about the same time,
- 4 posting or sharing or messaging around the same time?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 O About how much other stuff?
- 7 A That day it was about 300 between retweets and tweets.
- 8 Q Looking back at that moment, do you recall exactly what
- 9 you were thinking or what you are thinking?
- 10 A I don't recall exactly what I was thinking. But it was
- 11 sort of a shit post, like let me post these on Twitter, see
- 12 what happens, see if anyone picks it up, see if it goes viral.
- 13 Maybe even the media will pick it up, the Clinton campaign,
- 14 and then it rile them up, get under their skin, get them off
- 15 their message that they wanted to push.
- 16 O Before you shared these two memes, how many memes like
- 17 this or similar to this did you see online?
- 18 A I saw quite a few.
- 19 Q Did you have any particular reason to believe when you
- 20 saw and shared these particular memes that they had been put
- 21 thereby Microchip?
- 22 A No, I had no idea.
- 23 Q Did you share these two memes with any of the groups of
- 24 which you were a member?
- 25 A No.

- 19 Q There is a stipulation of what the English language
- 20 translation is, do you remember seeing that?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Essentially, I'm paraphrasing, it says you can vote by
- 23 text on November 8. Do you I have that essentially right?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q If you had been trying to trick anyone, would you have

- D. MACKEY DIRECT MR. FRISCH 684
- 1 | shared on November 1 telling people they could text on
- 2 November 8?
- 3 THE COURT: Please don't lead the witness.
- 4 MR. FRISCH: Yes, your Honor.
- 5 Q Fair to say you were not intending to trick any voters by
- 6 sharing that meme; is that right?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Let me show you what is 720. This is the other one that
- 9 you saw and shared?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q When you saw and shared it, did it have this avatar and
- 12 | this language in the upper left?
- 13 A Yes, it did.
- 14 Q So tell us about that avatar, what is that?
- 15 A That's Charlie Sheen playing the Ricky Vaughn character
- 16 except it's photoshopped to have a Make American Great Again
- 17 hat on, and a mask from the character Bane from Batman.
- 18 0 Who is Bane?
- 19 A Bane was one of the villains in Batman.
- 20 Q Why did you put the Bane mask on, or post this with the
- 21 Bane mask?
- 22 A Sort of a meme. If you're suspended, your account was
- 23 suspended, you would come back the next one with a Bane mask
- 24 on.
- 25 Q The words Publius Gaius, what does that mean?

When you saw these memes on 4chan with the hashtag, did

#ImWithHer and #GoHillary, were they there when you saw them?

Were they there when I saw?

23

24

25

D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 686

- 1 you put them on?
- 2 A I put them on.
- 3 Q Why?
- 4 A The Hillary Clinton campaign is constantly monitoring
- 5 their hashtag. If I put the hashtags on, then maybe they
- 6 would freak out about it, or they would have to spend time
- 7 dealing with it rather than focus on their campaign.
- 8 Q The third one, you testified about this earlier.
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Do you recall when you retweeted this one?
- 11 A November 2.
- 12 Q And this is different from the other two in the way that
- 13 you transmitted them; is that correct?
- 14 A Yes, it was retweet.
- 15 Q Do you see in the upper left it says: @TheRickyVaughn
- 16 thanks for spreading the word?
- 17 A Yes, that's a mention.
- 18 Q So explain again what you mean by, it's a mention?
- 19 A It says @TheRickyVaughn, that's a mention. So you get a
- 20 notification from Twitter that somebody has mentioned you in a
- 21 tweet. And so you can do what you like once you see the
- 22 tweet.
- 23 Q That's how you came to receive it, correct?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q That is when you retweeted it, correct?

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 Q There were chats that the Government introduced where the
- 3 terms fam and team were used. Do you recall those?
- 4 A Yes, I do.
- 5 Q Do you recall using those terms?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Why did you use those terms?
- 8 A Those are just terms of endearment essentially.
- 9 Q Did you believe you had any kind of silent agreement with
- 10 Microchip?
- 11 A No.
- 12 Q Of any sort?
- 13 A No.
- 14 Q When did you first move to Florida?
- 15 A April of 2018.
- 16 Q Why did you move to Florida?
- 17 A I had been doxed in the media. I needed to make a
- 18 change, and so that's what I did.
- 19 Q What happened? Why Florida?
- 20 A Florida had a program that I wanted to enter into, like
- 21 an intensive, like psychotherapy program so I could try to
- 22 turn my life around basically.
- 23 Q Was it in-patient or out-patient?
- 24 A It was in-patient.
- 25 Q For how long were you in the in-patient psychotherapy

D. MACKEY - DIRECT - MR. FRISCH 688

- 1 program?
- 2 A Two months.
- 3 Q When the two months of in-patient ended, did the
- 4 psychotherapy end?
- 5 A No, it didn't.
- 6 Q What happened then?
- 7 A Then there is out-patient psycho therapy after that.
- 8 Q Did you continue to live in Florida?
- 9 A Yes, I did.
- 10 Q How were things going for you in January 2021 before your
- 11 arrest?
- 12 A I think things were going pretty well. I had met a nice
- women that I wanted to marry. I had put a lot of things from
- 14 my past away. I was trying to change my life, do the right
- 15 thing. And I was in the process of making amends for some of
- 16 the things I had done wrong in the past.
- 17 Q What happened in January 2023?
- 18 A That's when I got married.
- 19 Q You and your wife have any children?
- 20 A No, we do not; but we have one on the way.
- 21 Q On January 27, 2021, after the agents took you to the
- 22 judge in Florida in the West Palm Beach courthouse, how did
- 23 | you plead to the charge against you?
- 24 A I pled not guilty.
- MR. FRISCH: Your Honor, I have nothing else. Thank

PROCEEDINGS 689

1 you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ahead of time.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen we'll take a few minutes so you can stretch your legs. Do not talk about the case at all. Don't let anybody approach you about the case don't look anything up. We'll see you in 15 minutes.

(Jury exits the courtroom.)

THE COURT: The witness can step down.

(Whereupon, the witness steps down.)

Everyone can have a seat.

THE COURT: Anything before we break?

MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor. Yesterday we discussed some communications with Amy Stephen. And I have some, I was going to share with your Honor and defense counsel beforehand. We will be showing the defendant a number of his own statements which fit within the parameters of what has been permitted already. These are new, I wanted to share them

THE COURT: Does Mr. Frisch have them already?

MR. PAULSEN: We're going to give it.

THE COURT: Why don't you give him those. I may have seen some of these, but I'm not positive.

MR. PAULSEN: Some of them were the materials that Judge Garaufis had.

THE COURT: I have those. All right I think it makes sense to take -- I know you've seen these before. Do

25

PROCEEDINGS 691 1 THE COURT: Any objection to that? 2 MR. FRISCH: I do. 3 THE COURT: What's the objection? 4 MR. FRISCH: First is the language in red 5 highlighted. I have to see what the questioning is. I mean, I didn't I didn't go into Amy Stephens at all on my direct, so 6 I have to see what the question is. 7 8 THE COURT: I think, if I recall correctly, this is 9 meant to be responsive to the questions you asked 10 Ms. Stephens, which included whether he was respectful, 11 polite, and a good kid. 12 MR. FRISCH: Well, the good kid I think you struck. You sustained it and took it out. 13 That may be, but you did ask the 14 THE COURT: 15 question. Go ahead. 16 MR. FRISCH: And the others have to do with the 17 context of his statement and her perception of him. I think 18 this is not about, it doesn't, this does not contradict what 19 her perception is of him. The fact that he may have had this 20 conversation about her our outside of her earshot or outside 21 of her ability to observe seems, to me, does not really prove 22 very much in her presence. He was respectful, insightful, and 23 thoughtful. 24 THE COURT: And this is just talking about her 25 behind her back basically, right?

PROCEEDINGS

692

MR. FRISCH: That's how I read it.

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, there's that, but also on 3 direct, defense counsel elicited the fact that the defendant's MAGA hat was visible on some of his tweets. Part of this 4 5 discussion is they essentially recruited Amy Stephens with the positive objective that, essentially, that their message would 6 7 be laundered through her because she was followed a large crowd of people that were unlike the defendant. They discuss 8 it in detail. I think he says I underestimated how important 9 10 her conversions was. 10,000 followers were white people. They essentially seduce her and use her to push their messages 11 12 further. The fact they were also unkind to her behind her back I think is relevant to other questions. But frankly, I 13

THE COURT: On the first page, there's something that you've agreed to take out, which should be taken out.

There's -- I'm now looking at -- this will be the fourth page, the top I think.

think it's all relevant, your Honor.

MR. FRISCH: I'm sorry, Judge, I lost you.

THE COURT: It's four, page four of the exhibit.

There's a three helpfully placed next to it, but I don't think that's it. So I'm just going to say that at the top, there is an obscenity to describe black people, which you've taken out. And then it says I think she is now Muslim and you've taken out death. But there's also, and I'm not going to say the

ToniAnn Lucatorto RPR, RMR, CRR

PROCEEDINGS 693 1 word, that shouldn't be there. 2 MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor. That was an 3 oversight, that will be gone too. MR. FRISCH: Your Honor, if we can go back to page 2 4 5 and 3.6 THE COURT: Sure. MR. FRISCH: So Mr. Ricky Vaughn is not on page two 7 8 and the dates is -- the first page is December 9th, the second 9 page is December 13th , and the third page is January 5th. 10 I'm not sure why that's in there, other than it has obvious 11 incendiary effect. 12 THE COURT: I think that can probably come out. 13 MR. PAULSEN: Page two? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor. They are talking about Ms. Stephens. 16 17 THE COURT: If he's not on it though, it's not 18 really responsive to the concern. 19 MR. PAULSEN: He doesn't respond. But yes, your 20 Honor, I understand. 21 MR. FRISCH: Then on page four, the last one has to 22 do with a notorious publication with horrible connections and 23 there's nothing from Mr. Vaughn after 416 and this is 641. It's just incendiary , it doesn't appear to have any 24

25

relevance.

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: I don't know if anyone knows what that publication is, but they may. Did you need that?

3 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, we can take the last comment out.

THE COURT: I think that's probably fine.

MR. FRISCH: Again, the next one, January 8th it was just a post. I understand the Government's argument about if it's in there, he saw it, or he's constructively aware of it. But on this kind of thing, I think there needs to be more than general membership in a group.

THE COURT: I think what follows and I'm specifically referring to page eight, shows that he knows what they're talking about and this is admiration. Let's see, I'm looking at --

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, to be clear, those two pages are not in group chats. They're both private messages with the defendant.

THE COURT: I see. And then the one on page 7 I think is Ms. Stephens?

MR. PAULSEN: Yes. Ms. Stephens, that's her talking.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FRISCH: Just to clarify, Judge, if you go back. So if you look at page seven -- I'm sorry, 1004-8, it talks about a character -- give me one moment.

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: This is the defendant, right, in the blue?

MR. FRISCH: That's correct. I'm not sure that I see any connection between --

MR. PAULSEN: So your Honor --

MR. FRISCH: Let me just finish. Before the reference to weaves race method, again, other than it being incendiary, and it doesn't seem to be connected -- it doesn't seem to be connected to what comes before or what that's a reference to, other than that the word race is there.

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, for some context. This a conversation with The Good Doctor, that is Doctor illusion, the host of the podcast that we played in this trial already. They are discussing how the defendant converted her prior to this and she appears on the podcast and then essentially agrees with him that women shouldn't be voting.

THE COURT: Let me say something generally about this. First of all, I'm going to permit those -- it is page eight.

MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: First of all, it's his words. I mean we've sanitized this a little bit to, I mean, quite a bit to prevent undue prejudice. But I don't think he's entitled to have his entire history sanitized. And in this context, I think it's relevant. Because clearly the people that are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

696

participating in this see him as a leader, and he's bragging about converting somebody who was, formerly didn't agree with him.

MR. FRISCH: So let me, if I can state the objection this way and I also want to call your Honor's attention to page ten of this series. He's charged with tricking voters into voting by text and he's a leader of a point of view There's a certain amount of cross examination online. directly relevant to that which might be incendiary, which I think is fair game. This is collateral about his relationship with someone. This has to do with a separate thread of his political positions that is tremendously far afield from challenging his credibility today or establishing any lack -any lack of credibility of what he's testified to about the charged crime. It's so collateral and so inflammatory that I think it needs to be precluded under 403. There's a certain amount of this that perhaps they can go into to show that while he was respectful in person, he wasn't necessarily respectful in trying to convert her away from her point of view to his point of view. But at the same time, these particular ways of doing it are inflammatory. It seems to me the questions can be asked about what he did, but it seems to me that to put this kind of language and to put her personal life into this is over the line. I think there 's a way to do this without this unduly and prejudicial and inflammatory

PROCEEDINGS 697

1 statements.

THE COURT: I would perhaps be more open to that argument if you hadn't brought out from him, I did sustain the good kid objection, although the jury did hear it. But you also brought out that she thought he was respectful, insightful, and thoughtful. And I think that merits a response. And so I think the Government is entitled to demonstrate that those character traits are not consistent with other behavior.

So you have an exception to my ruling, but I permit it. Be very careful about making sure those are redacted.

Anything else before we break?

MR. PAULSEN: No, your Honor. Everything else is the defendant's tweets.

MR. FRISCH: On page 1004-4. The third blue line, the last three words of the blue -- the third blue line, the last three words, I would ask that the Court preclude that under 403.

THE COURT: What's your response?

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, it wouldn't have any context. If he wants a different word that summarizes the same thought, I don't have a -- I'm not married to the word cuck but.

THE COURT: You want to just take it out?

MR. PAULSEN: Otherwise it just says -- white

PROCEEDINGS 698 1 people. 2 THE COURT: I don't even know what -- I mean, it's 3 a stupid word. I don't know that anyone knows that it means. 4 MR. FRISCH: My objection is --5 THE COURT: That it's a stupid word? 6 MR. FRISCH: 10,000 people follow her, the rest of

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it is just inflammatory and unnecessarily brings in precisely the issues that we discussed with Judge Garaufis that said that there are occasions that this kind of thing needs to be considered when trial comes. So I think that, you know, if you want to let it in, I understand that. 10,000 follow her, period, and the rest of us takes this trial to a different place.

THE COURT: I don't think that's accurate. At least in the context of this because the whole -- first of all, I don't think it's -- as I said, I think it's a stupid phrase. I don't think a lot of people know what it means, maybe they do. But there's nothing -- it's not, aside from whatever that word is, it's just referring to white people. And it's not like the other, you know, the other really vial references that I'm protecting him from himself on. So I'm permitting what I permitted and you have an exception to the ruling. So let's take a few minutes to be on a break.

MR. PAULSEN: Thank you your Honor.

(A recess was taken at this time.)

PROCEEDINGS 699 1 (In open court.) 2 (JUDGE ANN DONNELLY enters the courtroom.) 3 COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. THE COURT: Please be seated. 5 MR. FRISCH: Can I put something on the record, unrelated to our prior conference. I intended at the close of 6 7 the Government's place to put a placeholder. But because of 8 the way it worked, the jury was here, I couldn't do it. I 9 have been concerned as the trial has gone on that no case 10 agent has testified. Maegan Rees didn't testify, my friend Agent Granberg didn't testify, and ultimately Agent Dvorsky 11 12 did not testify. At one time or another. The key agent I'm 1.3 concerned with is Agent Rees. THE COURT: I'm having trouble hearing you. 14 15 MR. FRISCH: I'll sit down. 16 THE COURT: You're mostly concerned about Agent 17 Rees? 18 MR. FRISCH: I'm mostly concerned about why no case 19 agent testified and specifically whether there's a reason, a 20 bad reason, why Agent Rees's 3500 has not been provided, 21 obviously apart from when she attended Microchip interviews 22 and things like that. I just wanted to put a placeholder, 23 I'll discuss it with the Government, I don't want to hold things up. I wanted to register an objection at my earliest 24 25 opportunity so if I can come back to it, if necessary.

```
Mackey - Cross - Paulsen
                                                             700
 1
               THE COURT: That they're not calling her?
 2
               MR. FRISCH: Correct.
 3
               THE COURT: Do you want to call her?
 4
               MR. FRISCH: I don't know what she has, I don't know
 5
     what she said, I don't know what's in the reports. It's just
 6
     in my experience, it's highly unusual that a trial happens
 7
     without the case agent testifying, without any case agent
 8
     testifying. So I just want to --
 9
               THE COURT: I've had kind of the opposite
10
     experience. But I don't think it's necessary to discuss it
11
     now. But if there's some particular thing that you feel that
12
     you want to bring out from her that is irrelevant, you know,
13
     you can discuss it with the Government and, you know, if
14
     somebody wants to call her, they can call her. But I'll give
15
     you some more time later to expand upon your thoughts.
16
               Okay, let's have the defendant back on the stand and
17
     let's get the jury.
18
               (Witness takes the witness stand.)
19
20
21
               (Jury enters the courtroom.)
22
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: You may be seated.
23
               THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're
24
     ready to resume with the cross.
25
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Witness is reminded he's
```

```
Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 97 of 212 PageID #: 2417
                        CROSS - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                                701
  1
      still under oath.
  2
      CROSS-EXAMINATION
  3
      BY MR. PAULSEN:
           Good afternoon, Mr. Mackey?
  5
           Good afternoon.
           So I'd like to start by asking you again about this one,
  6
  7
      Government Exhibit 720. You said you got that on 4chan,
  8
      right?
  9
      Α
           Yes.
           You said you off the pol board; is that right?
 10
 11
           Yes.
 12
                 THE COURT: What board? I'm sorry.
                MR. PAULSEN: P-O-L with hashtags on each side.
 13
           You thought about it for a split second; is that right?
 14
 15
      Α
           Yes.
 16
           Did you think about it for a split second or did you
 17
      think about some effort to confuse the Clinton campaign? I
 18
      think you said both?
 19
           Yes, did I say both.
 20
          So which one is it?
 21
           Well, that's always what I was trying to do when I
 22
      posted.
 23
      Q
           Okay.
 24
                Why did you choose this one.
 25
           I just saw it and I posted it.
```

```
Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 98 of 212 PageID #: 2418
                        CROSS - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                                702
  1
           So you said there was a number of ones like this on
  2
      4chan; is that right?
  3
           Yes. I believe so.
           Why did you choose the one with the black woman?
  5
          No reason.
          Random choice?
  6
  7
           Yes.
           You thought that black voters were a very important group
  8
      in the upcoming election; is that right?
 10
           Yes, they were.
                MR. PAULSEN: Can I show you Government Exhibit 200.
 11
 12
      It's the 98th page in the big one. It's in evidence, your
 13
      Honor.
 14
                 THE COURT: Yes.
           You wrote, and this is redacted. The only thing standing
 15
 16
      in Trump's path is the black voters.
 17
           I did say is that.
      Α
 18
           You wrote that?
 19
      Α
           Yes.
 20
           Is that what you believed?
 21
      Α
           Yes.
 22
                MR. PAULSEN: Can you show 105.
 23
                 (The above-referenced exhibit was published to the
      jury.)
 24
 25
           You wrote; Obviously we can win Pennsylvania, the key is
```

- of times that the election was on a knifes edge, right?
- 22 A I did.
- 23 Q You said that many, many, many times?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Too close to call, you said things like that?

21 Q Vote for Hillary just means four more years of Hillary

Clinton taking black votes for granted. Send her a message

23 fam, hashtag never vote.

You sent those, right?

25 A Yes.

22

Mackey - Cross - Paulsen 705 1 The idea, if I get this right, was you wanted some 2 number of black people to chose not to vote, right? 3 Yes. And you sent other things like that; is that fair? 5 I think so. You know that the presentation the Government did was a 6 7 small sample of some of the stuff you did; is that right? 8 Yes, that's accurate. Okay. But you didn't want to trick black people out of 10 voting later; is that your testimony? 11 Yes, it is. 12 So you agree it that black vote is important in the 13 election? You said that a moment ago. 14 MR. PAULSEN: Can you bring me L5? 200-L-5. 15 (The above-referenced exhibit was published to the 16 jury.) 17 MR. PAULSEN: So we just looked at this a moment 18 ago. I'd like to show another one, your Honor. This is the 19 first of defendant's tweets we have not put in evidence. They 20 have all been authenticated through the stipulation, they are 21 all of the defendants statements. Would you like me to show 22 it to the parties and the Court first before I show it to the 23 jury? 24 25

Case 1:2	21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 103 of 212 PageID #: 2423
	SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 707
1	(Sidebar conference outside the hearing of the
2	jury.)
3	THE COURT: Let me just because I think these are
4	all things that you gotten in discovery, it's not something
5	you've never seen before.
6	MR. PAULSEN: Yes.
7	MR. FRISCH: I have not seen these before. I'm not
8	saying I didn't have available. The discover is voluminous.
9	I haven't seen everything, it's impossible.
10	THE COURT: I would assume you probably read all of
11	his tweets though. Is that what these are?
12	MR. PAULSEN: He has a lot of tweets as he said. He
13	has hundreds of thousands.
14	MR. FRISCH: So there's a lot of things in here that
15	are first of all, they're saturated. I understand the
16	propriety of doing some of this. But you go from one, to the
17	other, to the other. I haven't looked at all of them.
18	MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, I can add some
19	clarification. This is the entire thing in the packet. Some
20	are things I'm not offering at the moment because I think
21	they're fairly incendiary things that depends on what he says.
22	THE COURT: Those are things that depending why
23	don't we start with what you actually are going offer and I'll
24	take a look.

MR. PAULSEN: Sure. We have documents on black

25

708

- 1 turnout, which are similar to ones we've done before.
- 2 MR. FRISCH: Go slow. It's easy for me to read
- 3 these. Thank you. It's just not necessary.
- 4 THE COURT: This is one thing I do remember about
- 5 the election was that everybody was saying she had Parkinsons
- 6 Disease or something like that, or that she was coughing.
- 7 That's my recollection, but whatever.
- 8 MR. PAULSEN: It came in the -- that one we already
- 9 put in, that's in.
- 10 MR. FRISCH: You already put that one in; is that
- 11 | what you're saying?
- MR. PAULSEN: We put in the redacted version. It's
- 13 already in trial.
- 14 THE COURT: Please bear in mind we have the court
- 15 reporter.
- 16 MR. PAULSEN: So this is the one I'm offering right
- 17 now just saying write off the black vote. There's a number of
- 18 them that are about where he talked about women shouldn't the
- 19 vote.
- MR. FRISCH: I get it, fit in something about the
- 21 19th Amendment, but I object to this.
- 22 THE COURT: Okay. That objection is overruled.
- Next one.
- MR. PAULSEN: Why women shouldn't vote, reason
- 25 number 4 million.

THE COURT: I don't think we need a million of those. I think -- pick one of those.

MR. FRISCH: There's another one.

He took the stand and said he did not mean to fool anybody.

He has a long, established history of believing that black

people are confused and stupid, and things of that sort and

that women shouldn't vote. He says it constantly over again

and I think we're entitled to show this was not something he

said in a podcast, but this was one of his clear positions.

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, if I may be heard on this.

THE COURT: I don't have any problem with bringing out, and I know you don't like it, but it 's definitely relevant to the scheme that's alleged. But what I will permit you to do is pick a few of them and you can say that he expressed similar sentiments in other tweets. You don't have a problem with that, do you?

MR. FRISCH: I hope he doesn't pick the most incendiary ones, but in theory, no.

MR. PAULSEN: If he doesn't acknowledge that he has said that many times --

THE COURT: Then you can go through it. Part of this is contingent on any cross on what the defendant says.

All I'm saying is that a few of these make the point because he clearly has a very -- it's not like a maybe people shouldn't be able to vote. He feels quite strongly about it.

710

1 I'm not going to limit you to the ones that you pick because

2 I think they're all relevant. I'm to just going through them.

3 It's just his opinion that women -- it's impossible to have a

4 functioning government when single women and single mothers

5 vote. It's unbelievable that we allow unmarried women to

6 vote. I mean, that's kind of the same thing so I don't know

why you would need both of those.

MR. PAULSEN: Well, I can pick one if you want.

THE COURT: You don't have to pick one. I'm just

10 saying I can't count. I mean right now I've counted.

MR. PAULSEN: I think you finished the end of the

12 women section.

7

8

9

11

13

14

19

25

THE COURT: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 --

MR. PAULSEN: There's nine.

15 THE COURT: 8, 9, 1011, 12, 13. So if he's to say I

never said that, go to town. But I would say of these you may

pick five and then I know you object basically to that. So I

18 think we've covered that aspect of it.

Let's go through the rest of it, shall we.

MR. PAULSEN: The next category, your Honor, is

21 black people will agree to anything they read on Twitter and

22 we let them vote. Why.

23 THE COURT: That is relevant because he said he did

24 not think that black people were gullible.

MR. FRISCH: For the record, this is a year before.

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 711 1 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, this is -- I'm sorry. 2 THE COURT: It's what he believes and in the context 3 of this case unless there's evidence that he changed his opinion, this is relevant. 5 MR. PAULSEN: It's absolutely relevant, your Honor. THE COURT: Let me just look at what else is there. 6 7 MR. PAULSEN: This the only one like that, the 8 other one --9 THE COURT: Stop. 10 MR. PAULSEN: Sorry. I'm a little punchy today. 11 THE COURT: It's okay. 12 MR. PAULSEN: That is a proposed redaction. 13 THE COURT: These are right before the election. 14 This is --15 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, so if I can preface these. 16 There's two where he also then says that he thinks that 17 immigrants shouldn't vote either. Given that he pushed out a 18 Spanish language one, there's two of those, we think those 19 should be relevant as well. 20 THE COURT: All right, here's my ruling. I have 21 looked at these and I agree that they are relevant. 22 MR. PAULSEN: The last few are the incendiary ones I 23 don't know he opened the door. 24 THE COURT: I don't think so either. So just for 25 the record, just for the record, the last is this one in.

712

1 right.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PAULSEN: No, but Judge Garaufis said that he 3 believed if the defendant took the stand because he's commenting on this --

THE COURT: That's what I remember, I think, because I didn't see this before.

MR. FRISCH: I don't recall that's what he said. don't know if we ever teed that up with Judge Garaufis.

THE COURT: Well, it's Judge Donnelly now. So I'll take a look at it.

So here's the point. I don't want to pause the cross -examination. You can; on each of these topics, women, black people, minorities, and immigrants pick a select few. But you can, and I'm not going to just let you pick them without us checking. If you put up one that is really really, bad I may not let you do it. But let's do a representative sample, and you can object or if it's something that you want that's based on a prior discussion, you can do that too. But so that's how we'll do each one.

MR. PAULSEN: My only further request is when it comes to turnout, we selected there was four similar ones that were all the day he sent these, and I wanted to draw out that this was on your mind the day you did it.

THE COURT: That's fine.

(End of sidebar conference.)

TONIANN LUCATORTO, RPR, RMR, CRR

Stop trying to persuade them to vote for Trump.

that right?

24

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 714
- 1 Q Yes.
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q You don't want the votes anymore, you've moving on; is
- 4 that right?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q Do you remember Special Agent Cunder had a chart where he
- 7 had looked at hashtags that were dropped into the group you
- 8 were in and he looked to see if you acted on them?
- 9 A Well, I don't know if he looked to see I acted on them.
- 10 They were hashtags that were trending at the time. I don't
- 11 think I necessarily acted on them from seeing them in the
- 12 group, considering they were widely trending and everybody
- 13 that was following was using those hashtags.
- 14 Q Do you remember there was one hashtag that you didn't
- 15 use? It was only one zero?
- 16 A I don't recall.
- 17 Q Okay. Would it surprise you it was blacks for Trump?
- 18 A Yes, it would surprise me.
- 19 Q Now, you talked a lot of black turnout; is that right?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q It was important for your political opponents at the time
- or the side you didn't root for?
- 23 A Yes. Black turnout was important.
- Q We showed a number of those documents with Special Agent
- 25 Cunder; is that right?

Is it fair to say you were fairly preoccupied with the

turnout of black voters s on that topic, the day you sent

24

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN these out? A Something that I commented on. (Continued on the next page.)

(End of sidebar conference.)

19 (Continued on the next page.)

22

18

20

21

23

24

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN

- 1 (In open court.)
- 2 BY MR. PAULSEN:
- 3 Q I think we were at 1005-01. Mr. Mackey, did you write:
- 4 Your problem is going to be low black turnout and high white
- 5 working-class turnout.
- Did you send that?
- 7 A Yes. It appears to be a reply tweet.
- 8 Q One more, number four please, Ms. Parshad.
- 9 Very slight changes in the electorate will lead to a
- 10 Trump landslide, small increase in white non-college voters,
- 11 small decrease in blacks.
- 12 Did you send that?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q This is all the day that you sent these memes; is that
- 15 | fair to say?
- 16 A Yes, it appears so.
- 17 Q This was on your mind, a small decrease in black turnout
- 18 | might matter?
- 19 A Yes, that was on my mind.
- 20 Q Isn't it true, Mr. Mackey, that you thought that the
- 21 group of people we're discussing, the race of the individual
- 22 in this ad, that you thought that they were, would have fallen
- 23 for this?
- 24 A Can you repeat the question please?
- 25 Q Isn't it fair to say, Mr. Mackey, that you thought that

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 720
- 1 black people would have fallen for a trick like this?
- 2 A I don't know anyone would fall for this kind of a post.
- 3 Q Isn't it true that you thought black people were
- 4 particularly gullible?
- 5 A I did say that in the past, yes.
- 6 Q Did you not believe it?
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q You didn't?
- 9 A No, I didn't.
- 10 Q You thought black people were as credulous as anyone
- 11 else?
- 12 A I don't know, probably.
- 13 Q Did you think black people were as smart as everyone
- 14 else?
- 15 A I don't know.
- 16 Q There was a lot of black people on Twitter I imagine,
- 17 right?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q You talked about black Twitter before as like a thing?
- 20 A Yes, I have.
- 21 Q Twitter has a lot of info, right?
- 22 A A lot of info?
- 23 Q Info, information.
- 24 A I would say so.
- 25 Q You could use Twitter and things comes fast at you; is

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 722
- 1 okay Twitter. And we let them vote why?
- 2 A Yes, I wrote that.
- 3 Q What did you mean by that?
- 4 A It reads like a disparaging comment about African
- 5 Americans.
- 6 Q Why did you say that? Why shouldn't black people vote?
- 7 A Why shouldn't they vote?
- 8 Q I'm asking you what meant when you wrote that.
- 9 A When I wrote that, it says because they believe anything
- 10 they read on Twitter.
- 11 Q But you said a moment ago nobody would be fooled by this.
- 12 A I don't think anything would be fooled by this.
- 13 Q You just said black people, they believe everything they
- 14 | read on Twitter and they shouldn't vote for that reason.
- 15 A That's clearly a hyperbolic statement.
- 16 O So you think that's not something you meant?
- 17 A I think it's an exaggeration.
- 18 Q Do you think that's the only time you said something like
- 19 that?
- 20 A No, I don't think so.
- MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, I'd like latitude to show
- 22 the rest of them.
- THE COURT: One by one.
- 24 BY MR. PAULSEN:
- 25 Q Can I show Government's Exhibit 1005-25. Did you write:

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 119 of 212 PageID #: 2439 D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 723 1 LOL blacks literally believe everything they see on CNN --2 MR. FRISCH: Your Honor. 3 MR. PAULSEN: Sorry. 4 THE COURT: It's the procedure we discussed at the 5 side. 6 MR. PAULSEN: I apologize. 7 THE COURT: Do you object to this? 8 MR. FRISCH: I do. 9 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. But please 10 follow that protocol. 11 (Government Exhibit 1005-25, was received in 12 evidence.) 1.3 MR. PAULSEN: Ms. Parshad, everything that I'm going 14 to show we're going to show to the parties first. I 15 apologize. 16 BY MR. PAULSEN: 17 Please publish this. Did you write: LOL blacks 18 literally believe everything they see on CNN, believe that the 19 border line of Brooklyn lies the KKK. 20 I did say that. 21 Did you believe that? 22 That's another exaggerated statement. I don't think 23 that's literally true. 2.4 What about 1005-26, only to the parties and the witness. 25 May I publish?

THE COURT: You can display it.

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 124 of 212 PageID #: 2444 D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 728 1 MR. FRISCH: I don't want to take the time --2 THE COURT: I understand. 3 MR. FRISCH: You understand the objection that I 4 have based on our conversation and what your Honor said at the 5 sidebar. 6 THE COURT: Yes. The objection is overruled. 7 (Government Exhibit 1005-29, was received in 8 evidence.) 9 Mr. Mackey, did you write: Black people will believe 10 literally anything and that is the source of racial tensions 11 in America. 12 Yes. 1.3 Also an exaggeration? 14 Yes. 15 Did you say anything sincere about black people on 16 Twitter? 17 I assume so. 18 But these are all tongue in cheek. None of this is --19 I'm not saying tongue and cheek, I'm saying exaggeration, 20 hyperbole. 21 Sitting here today, you didn't believe black people were 22 especially gullible?

At the time I don't know that they were more gullible

Would it surprise you that they are the group that you

23

24

25

than anyone else.

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 125 of 212 PageID #: 2445 D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 729 1 tend to say these things about? 2 MR. FRISCH: Objection. 3 THE COURT: Rephrase. 4 Did you in fact say these things about black people? 5 Yes. 6 Do you think there is a difference between gullible and 7 stupid? 8 Yes, I do. Do you think black people are stupid? 10 Are you asking me if I believe that today? 11 Q Sure. 12 Α No. 1.3 Did you believe it back in 2016 and 2015? 14 Yes. You did. 15 16 Ms. Parshad, can I show 1005-24. You can show that 17 to the parties. 18 Did you send that tweet? 19 Yes. 20 MR. PAULSEN: May I publish, your Honor? 21 MR. FRISCH: I object. 22 THE COURT: Overruled. 23 (Government Exhibit 1005-24, was received in 24 evidence.) 25 Did you write, Mr. Mackey, that: Meanwhile blacks have

You didn't want this to work then; is that correct?

Do you want to put a question to the witness please?

24

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 731
- 1 A It's not that I didn't want it to work, it wasn't my
- 2 | intention that anyone would be deceived.
- 3 Q It was a yes or no question.
- 4 A Repeat it?
- 5 Q You didn't want it to work, did you?
- 6 A I don't understand the question. I didn't want it to
- 7 | work? I didn't think it would work. I wasn't trying to get
- 8 | it to work, that wasn't the purpose.
- 9 Q Okay. So you picked this one randomly, you sent that
- meme?
- 11 A I saw it on 4chan.
- 12 Q You typed these things in though, right?
- 13 A I typed in the hashtags, is that what you mean?
- 14 O Yes.
- 15 A Yes, I did.
- 16 Q You typed in the #ImWithHer?
- 17 A Yes, I did.
- 18 Q You've talked at various points, we've seen evidence of
- 19 you hijacking hashtags?
- 20 A Yes, that's right.
- 21 Q Let's show 200-B-6 in evidence. You said you could
- 22 hijack hashtags with memes?
- 23 A Yes, I did.
- 24 THE COURT: Slowly please.
- 25 Q Was this an example of that?

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 732 1 Α Was this an example of that? 2 Yes? 3 Yes, I would say so. But you said you didn't want anyone to fall for it? 5 Well, hijacking a hashtag is not about tricking people or 6 deceiving people. 7 But it is, am I correct, though, that if you're using the 8 #ImWithHer hashtag, it's because you want this to be seen by 9 the sort of person who is searching for #ImWithHer; is that 10 right? 11 Yes. 12 The people who were searching with #ImWithHer are the 13 people who are presumably supporters of former presidential 14 candidate Clinton? 15 Yes, especially the ones working for her. 16 So your testimony is that you only wanted to bother the 17 campaign; is that right? 18 The campaign, the media, anyone who saw this would know 19 that you can't vote from home. So if they were a Hillary 20 Clinton supporter they would become upset by it, whether it's 21 a supporter, campaign worker, et cetera. That had the 22 potential to become a news story that would hijack their 23 narrative that she likes to push rather than -- she would have 24 to discuss this, or maybe this would upset her, knock her off 25 her game rather than the message that she wanted to push that

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN day, whether it was jobs, economy, it doesn't matter. was about knocking her off her message by creating a fire storm. MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, may I have a sidebar? THE COURT: Sure. (Continued on the next page.)

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 734 1 (Sidebar conference.) 2 MR. PAULSEN: I would ask for a bit of advice on how 3 would you like to me to handle when I ask a yes or no answer 4 and he gives a speech. 5 THE COURT: I'm not going to give you advice. But 6 if you have an objection to him saying that, you can make it. 7 Or you can let him speak and then you can ask him some other 8 questions. MR. PAULSEN: I didn't know if there is a mechanism 9 10 you prefer to ask him not give speeches. 11 THE COURT: Here is what I don't want you to do. I 12 suspected that you were starting to point out that he 13 basically gave yes or no answers on direct and now he's being 14 more expressive, and you can certainly argue that in summation 15 if you wish. But if you want to nicely suggest to him to do 16 his best to answer the question that asked, you can do that. 17 Mr. Frisch? 18 MR. PAULSEN: My recollection is our witness 19 answered his questions. 20 THE COURT: I think he's asked several times for

people to answer something yes or no. You can do that.

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not going to give advice on what I think is a good cross-examination tactic.

MR. PAULSEN: I was trying to find out what was acceptable to you. I didn't want to shut down the witness.

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 736
- 1 (In open court.)
- 2 THE COURT: Next question.
- 3 MR. PAULSEN: Thank you, your Honor.
- 4 BY MR. PAULSEN:
- 5 Q Mr. Mackey, when Special Agent Cunder testified he walked
- 6 you through some the groups that you were in. Do you recall
- 7 that?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Before we get to that, I think you testified on direct
- 10 that you stopped working shortly before the 2016 election?
- 11 A Six months before, five months, something like that.
- 12 Q Did you have another job during that time?
- 13 A No, I did not.
- 14 Q So you had free time to do Internet things, I imagine; is
- 15 | that fair?
- 16 A Yes, that's fair.
- 17 Q I'd like to start with the War Room. You were a member
- of that group from the beginning; is that right?
- 19 A I think so.
- 20 Q Can we put up 400-01? If we can zoom in on the front
- 21 first DM. This is the one that began with a statement of
- 22 purpose. Would you agree, that's what that was?
- 23 A I think this is the first time I've seen it; but I guess,
- 24 yes.
- 25 Q You were in the room. You respond that day; isn't that

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 737

- 1 fair?
- 2 A I don't recall responding that day; but if you say I did,
- 3 then I probably did.
- 4 Q This says we have to work together like a unit so let's
- 5 keep this group open and use it like our strategy War Room.
- 6 Do you see that?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q That's how it worked, right?
- 9 A In the beginning that's how it did work, yes.
- 10 Q This was a group of prominent individuals on Twitter?
- 11 A A lot of them were prominent.
- 12 Q A number of people who had big followings, things of that
- 13 sort.
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q This was to be generally kept free of tweets; is that
- 16 right?
- 17 A It was in the beginning; but it became completely filled
- 18 with tweets towards the end. It was basically unreadable.
- 19 Q It was a place for coordination; is that fair?
- 20 A That was the intention when it was started up on
- 21 August 1st, yes.
- 22 Q Do you recall that Special Agent Cunder showed that chart
- 23 500, do you recall that?
- 24 A Are you referring to the chart with the hashtags?
- 25 Q That's the one.

Twitter, you looked at the War Room?

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 739
- 1 A When I logged in I looked at War Room?
- 2 O Yes.
- 3 A In general? Every day? What are you referring to?
- 4 Q Whenever you logged into Twitter.
- 5 A No, I didn't look at War Room every time I logged into
- 6 Twitter.
- 7 Q You weren't paying attention?
- 8 A I had the group on mute so I wouldn't get the
- 9 notifications because there were so many messages coming in
- 10 every day.
- 11 Q You didn't want to act in a coordinated way with all
- 12 these people?
- 13 A I didn't need to look at the War Room to coordinate with
- 14 | everyone else. What they were tweeting was public. I would
- 15 see it in my feed because I followed many of them. Then it
- 16 | would go viral and it would trend on the trending topics on
- 17 the left.
- So when I see the trend on the topic and it's
- 19 trending, then I'll tweet about it. Or I just see my friends
- 20 | are talking about, so I'll talk about it. I don't have to
- 21 look in the War Room to know that.
- 22 Q It's a coincidence that your activity always matched what
- 23 the War Room is doing?
- 24 A It's not a coincidence. What the War Room was doing was
- 25 making the hashtags go public, widely available, and trend

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN

- 1 them. So of course, if they were talking about something in
- 2 the War Room, I would see it go viral, I would see it trend, I
- 3 | would see my friends talking about it. When my friends are
- 4 tweeting about a hashtag and I liked the hashtag, then I will
- 5 join in. It's sort of a natural thing.
- 6 Q Lots of things are trending at any given moment; isn't
- 7 | that fair?
- 8 A Yes, but not all about politics, things I'm interested
- 9 in.
- 10 Q But always the ones that the War Room is talking about,
- 11 | that you're doing?
- 12 A Of course because that's the top trends, the top trends
- are on the left when you log into Twitter, that's the first
- 14 thing you see. Why wouldn't I tweet about something that was
- 15 in the top trends. If I was interested in the topic, of
- 16 | course I would tweet about it.
- 17 Q I'd like to ask you about some of people in that room.
- 18 A Okay.
- 19 Q Who is HalleyBorderCol?
- 20 A That's someone I just know as HalleyBorderCol. I don't
- 21 know anything more about that person.
- 22 Q Nothing more?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q What about Mia4trump?
- 25 A Same thing. I know the handle, familiar with the handle.

Next line: People vote early and we need time for our

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 742
- 1 rumor to spread.
- 2 Do you remember that?
- 3 A I remember when Agent Cunder read it, yes.
- 4 Q So this is another example of something you didn't see?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q HalleyBorderCol writes: People aren't rational. A
- 7 | significant portion of people who hear a rumor will not hear
- 8 the rumor has been debunked. Even so, they might not trust
- 9 it. A big risk to take.
- 10 Do you agree with those sentiments?
- 11 A Yes, I do.
- 12 Q You do. So if you're your going to spread something, you
- don't want to spread it the day of, you want to spread it the
- 14 | week before, right?
- 15 A If that's your intention.
- 16 Q The last line is Microchip; is that right?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q There is a whole series of 4chan tactical nuke memes like
- 19 this and gives a link.
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q We saw a few references to 4chan here?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Do you recall Microchip saying that the War Room was a
- 24 strategy group?
- 25 A I do. I think that was Gerald Wine.

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 743
- 1 Q You're right, Gerald Wine wrote it.
- 2 A Yes, you showed me that.
- 3 Q I meant, when Microchip testified do you recall him
- 4 saying the same thing?
- 5 A Yes, I do.
- 6 Q He had said that it was expected that you would grab
- 7 things from 4chan or other places in response to the War
- 8 Room's ideas?
- 9 A He said that it was expected? I don't recall him saying
- 10 that. If he said it, then sure.
- 11 Q Do you recall him stating that -- let me rephrase.
- Do you recall him saying that he would get things
- 13 from 4chan if he thought it kind of fit the narrative they
- 14 | were pushing?
- 15 A He testified to that?
- 16 Q Do you recall him testifying to that?
- 17 A I don't. But I believe he probably testified to that.
- 18 Q Now I'd like to go to 400-31.
- Do you recall seeing these memes in the War Room?
- 20 A I recall seeing them when they were introduced into
- 21 evidence or when we were reviewing the discovery with my
- 22 attorney.
- 23 Q That's another example of something you didn't see in the
- 24 War Room?
- 25 A Again, there were over 600 messages coming in per day in

That's the person who shared those --

The person I was following.

23

24

25

Α

Yes.

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN

- 1 THE COURT: Let him finish.
- THE WITNESS: Apologies.
- 3 Q Correct, that HalleyBorderCol is the one who shared the
- 4 two vote by text and vote by hashtag memes to the War Room?
- 5 A I remember seeing this one because I retweeted it. I
- don't know about the other one. You'll have to refresh me.
- 7 Q You going back to DraftOurDaughters, though, you
- 8 retweeted Mia4trump?
- 9 A I assume so.
- 10 Q You rewetted Microchip?
- 11 A I retweeted those people all the time. I followed them,
- most of them.
- 13 Q HalleyBorderCol as well?
- 14 A I think so.
- 15 Q So all these individuals, so I understand this right, are
- 16 | with you in the War Room; is that right?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q There is a discussion of DraftOurDaughters; is that
- 19 right?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q They all retweet DraftOurDaughters, so do you; is that
- 22 right?
- 23 A Yes, that's right.
- 24 Q But you're not paying attention to any of this?
- 25 A Well, DraftOurDaughters was one of the biggest hashtags

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 746 1 of all of them, that one was everywhere, everyone was tweeting 2 that and it made the news. I was all over, that hashtag. 3 was tweeting it. 4 And you're talking about some of the biggest 5 accounts on Twitter. Twitter has an algorithm. I believe 6 they had an algorithm at the time. When the big accounts are 7 tweeting, it will show up in your algorithm or feed and you're 8 going to see it. And I can click on the hashtag and look at 9 DraftOurDaughters --10 MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: I think it's so much easier if you just 12 answer the question that is being asked. I know your lawyer, 13 if he wants to bring out some of this on redirect, he can do 14 that. But just do your best just to answer the question that 15 you're being asked without -- let's try that. 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Next question. 18 BY MR. PAULSEN: 19 Most of my questions are yes or no questions. I asked 20 some open-ended questions, but most are yes or no. 21 My apologies, Mr. Paulsen. 22 No worries at all. 23 Ms. Parshad, could you jump to the next page. 24 Do you recall seeing this page discussed during the 25 trial?

```
D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                               748
 1
          So here, Microchip got a message from somebody; is that
 2
     right?
 3
          Yes.
          An individual named Lauren Nann?
 5
          Yes.
          Wrote him and was upset that Donald Trump didn't have
 6
 7
     this as well; is that right?
 8
          It appears that's what he said, yes.
          You must have been surprised to see this, right?
10
          When I saw it in the discovery?
          You didn't see it back then?
11
12
     Α
          No.
13
          But so -- all right.
14
               So when you first saw it then, you must have been
15
     surprised, right?
16
          Yes, I was surprised.
17
          Because you said nobody would fall for this, right?
18
          Yes.
19
          Is this is it fair to say that Microchip sent this out
20
     and a Trump voter fell for it?
21
          I'm not sure what he means we should do our own.
                                                             Like we
22
     should do our own memes or what, but it's possible a Trump
23
     fell for it based on this tweet.
24
          Microchip wrote; Here's what I'm worried about. Greg.
```

People on Trump's side thinking this is legit and they stay

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 749
- 1 home. I'm plotting, will have something soon.
- 2 That's what it says?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And then Unity Activist has some more suggestions about
- 5 how to tweak it, right?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q You sent your memes, I guess it's two days later; is that
- 8 right?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q And you're saying you didn't watch any of this?
- 11 A Yes. I am.
- 12 Q Now, you sent your first on November 1st; is that right?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q And about seven hours later, you sent another?
- 15 A Yes; that is right.
- 16 Q And you retweeted one from nia4_Trump; is that right?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q You said that one was on November 2nd?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q How do you remember the exact time?
- 21 A Because I saw it in the discovery.
- 22 Q It doesn't have a date on it, though?
- 23 A Because it would have come after I sent the second one.
- 24 And my account was suspended on the 2nd, therefore, I would
- 25 have to retweet it on the 2nd.

```
D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                              750
 1
          Okay. So you assume it's in that time period in between?
 2
          I assume based on those facts that it would have had to
 3
     be on the 2nd, because my account was suspended that day. I
     could be wrong, it could have been on the 1st.
 5
          She thanked you when she sent out the tweet; is that
 6
     right?
 7
     Α
          Yes.
         Now, she was a member of the war room; is that right?
          I think so, yes.
10
          Now, that tweet, the nia4_Trump one, this one
11
     (indicating.)
12
               Do you recall seeing that in another part of this
13
     trial?
14
          Yes, I just saw it.
15
         No, I mean --
16
               MR. PAULSEN: Let me rephrase.
17
          Do you recall seeing that photo in the --
          Yes. You just showed it to me.
18
19
               THE COURT: First of all, you must let him finish
20
     the question. Please put question again.
21
               MR. PAULSEN: I'll ask it differently.
22
          Do you recall seeing that photo in one of your -- the
23
     different groups you were a member of; the Mad Men group?
24
     Α
          No.
25
               MR. PAULSEN: Ms. Parshad, can you put up Government
```

- 18 evidence. Sorry, that's is wrong one. We can move on.
- 19 Besides these three, did you send any others?
- 20 Not that I recall.
- 21 Could you have sent more?
- 22 I don't think so. It's possible.
- 23 Do you recall the technical employee from Twitter,
- 24 Michael Anderson that testified? Do you remember him?
- 25 Yes, I do.

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 752
- 1 Q Do you remember that he said if something deleted a tweet
- 2 that you later retweeted, it would sort of vanish from
- 3 Twitter. Do you recall him saying that?
- 4 A I do.
- 5 Q I think he called it an orphan retweet or something like
- 6 that. Does that sound familiar?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Do you recall in the Warm Room, nia4_Trump said she
- 9 deleted some of the things she did?
- 10 A I don't recall seeing that.
- 11 Q Well --
- MR. PAULSEN: Let me rephrase.
- 13 Q You pushed forward the nia4_Trump one; is that right?
- 14 A I retweeted it, yes.
- 15 Q Did you retweet anybody else's?
- 16 A I don't recall retweeting anyone else's.
- 17 Q Mr. Mackey, you had a loyalty army on Twitter?
- 18 A Yes, I did.
- 19 Q You talked a lot about this, right?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q So what would happen if you tweeted something to your
- 22 army?
- 23 A They would retweet it, they would comment on it, they
- 24 would like it.
- 25 Q So you should have had every expectation that when you

```
D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
```

- 1 | tweeted these things that loyal army would do the same, right?
- 2 A I don't know what they would do. Usually they just
- 3 | retweet. You mean they would tweet messages?
- 4 Q What I just said.
- 5 A It didn't cross my mind.
- 6 Q It didn't cross your mind?
- 7 A It didn't cross my mind that they would take it
- 8 elsewhere, but it's certainly possible.
- 9 Q Didn't you talk extensively about how your full awareness
- 10 | that when you did something people responded?
- 11 A Yes. They did.
- 12 Q Okay. But for this one, you didn't expect that?
- 13 A No, that's not what I'm saying. I did expect they
- 14 respond. I thought you meant that they would do other things
- 15 with it. I had no idea what they were going to do. I
- 16 expected they would retweet it, they would like it, they would
- 17 quote tweet it, they would respond to it.
- 18 Q You expected when you would push something out, others
- 19 | would push it further; is that fair?
- 20 A Yes, yes.
- 21 Q Now, you called yourself a leader of sorts; didn't you?
- 22 A Yes, I did.
- 23 Q Were you?
- 24 A Yes, I would say so.
- 25 Q Is that part of the reason your followers responded to

- 1 you?
- 2 A Yes. I think so.
- 3 Q You understood the weight that your words carried with
- 4 the people in your group?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 MR. PAULSEN: Can I show Government Exhibit 200D-19
- 7 . The bottom part.
- 8 Q So someone whose name is redacted wrote; You don't
- 9 realize the weight your words carry. Your account is much
- 10 larger than the follower account would lead one to believe.
- 11 You understood that, right?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Did you understand it when you tweeted something, you
- 14 | should expect it to move?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q The MIT study, do you recall the witnesses about that?
- 17 A Yes, I do.
- 18 Q You were very proud of that rank, right?
- 19 A I was surprised by it. I was proud of it, yes.
- 20 Q It was talked about a lot in the groups, right?
- 21 A Yes, it was.
- 22 Q Is it fair to say it seemed to you that the other people
- 23 in the groups were rather impressed by that?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q That was your particular power, right? Your ability to

- 1 kind of get things to get retweeted further?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q Now, you communicated with members outside of these
- 4 groups, outside of Twitter as well as well; isn't that right?
- 5 A Some of them, yes.
- 6 Q How did you normally do that?
- 7 A It would have been on -- I was a member of Slack. I
- 8 could communicate with people on the phone.
- 9 MR. PAULSEN: I'd like to show you Government
- 10 Exhibit 410-A.
- 11 Q Do you recall this Mr. Mackey?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q This is -- it's fair to say this is the micro chat?
- 14 A Yes, it is.
- 15 Q And this is around about the time you got kicked out of
- 16 Twitter the first time?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q It says; Anyone hear from Ricky? Someone wrote he's
- 19 still in this chat but not in this other. Someone else writes
- 20 he's been active on Facebook. Is that all right?
- 21 A Yes, that's right.
- Q Vendetta92429 says he replied to a message from me on
- 23 there. I was showing him some of the fan art in the memes.
- Who is Vendetta92429?
- 25 A I just knew him as Vendetta.

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 756
- 1 Q It's a guy, it's a girl?
- 2 A I think it's a guy.
- 3 Q Don't know his real name?
- 4 A No. I don't think so.
- 5 Q Now, in some of these group chats after you left, there
- 6 was a discussion about when the vote by text memes should be
- 7 | released. Do you remember seeing them?
- 8 A Are you referring to the Mad Man groups?
- 9 Q Mad Man and others?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Do you recall that there was a discussion that it should
- 12 be a week before the election?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 MR. PAULSEN: Can I show Government Exhibit 430-49?
- 15 49, I misspoke. I apologize your Honor.
- 16 Q Do you remember this page?
- 17 A Yes, I saw it during the trial.
- MR. PAULSEN: Zoom in the middle, please, Ms.
- 19 Parshad.
- 20 Q It says don't post it though a week or less before the
- 21 election. Do you recall that?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q What was a week before the election in 2016?
- 24 A It would have been November 1st.
- 25 Q Is that the day you did it?

- Α Yes.
- 2 Is that a coincidence?
- 3 Yes. I wasn't even a member of this group.
- Do you remember 1080P in this group?
- 5 Yes, I do. Α
- What do you know about 1080P? 6
- 7 Nothing besides his name is 1080P.
- 8 No facts about him?
- No. I don't recall anything about 1080P.
- 10 Is it fair to say he appeared to be the one that made a
- 11 lot of things?
- 12 Based on the discovery that we reviewed, yes.
- 13 He's also the one that shared a group, an article, right
- 14 after you were suspended from Twitter?
- 15 I don't recall that, but if you're saying it I'll take
- 16 your word for it.
- 17 MR. PAULSEN: Can we show Government Exhibit 430-64.
- 18 Do you remember this slide?
- 19 Yes.
- 20 MR. FRISCH: I'm sorry, I object. I think.
- 21 THE COURT: Is it in evidence?
- 22 MR. FRISCH: I don't object to the document. I
- 23 object to the questioning. It's not worth a sidebar, I'll
- 24 withdraw the objection.
- 25 THE COURT: Go ahead.

```
Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 154 of 212 PageID #: 2474
                       D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                                 758
  1
            Do you recall, Mr. Mackey, seeing a private discussion
  2
      with 1080P about these vote by text memes?
  3
            Yes.
  4
                 MR. PAULSEN: Can you show Government
  5
      Exhibit 200-Q-2.
  6
            Do you remember this one, Mr. Mackey?
  7
      Α
            Yes.
  8
           One of these --
  9
                 MR. FRISCH: I'm sorry, I think I have to object.
       don't want to necessarily do it in open court, I apologize.
 10
 11
                 THE COURT: Are you asking for a sidebar?
 12
                 MR. FRISCH: I am.
 13
                 (Continued on the next page.)
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
```

That's one with an avatar, or username Mr. Charlie Coker.

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 761
- 1 Q Did you know him?
- 2 A No.
- 3 Q You were in groups with him?
- 4 A Okay. There were 50 people in the group. I don't
- 5 remember every single avatar. I mean, some I just recognize
- 6 the same, some I don't remember the name.
- 7 Q He said that he hoped some stoners would fall for it,
- 8 especially in Colorado; is that right?
- 9 A Yes he did.
- 10 Q You didn't want that. Is that your testimony?
- 11 A No. I don't think I tweeted that meme, so.
- 12 Q No, but in general. You didn't want some people in
- 13 Colorado to fall for this?
- 14 A No.
- MR. FRISCH: I object to the question.
- 16 A I never saw this.
- 17 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 18 A No.
- MR. PAULSEN: Now, if I can pull up Mad Men 430-43.
- 20 Q Mr. Mackey, do you remember this?
- 21 A From the discovery. Yes.
- 22 Q You were in the room at this time?
- 23 A I was in the room. Yes. It was before I was suspended
- 24 out of the room.
- 25 Q That's right. What did you think of this when it was

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 762
- 1 sent on February 26, 2016?
- 2 A I don't recall that it was sent on February 26th. What
- 3 did I think of if? I don't know what you mean.
- 4 Q Do you remember seeing this on September -- did I say
- 5 February, I'm sorry. September 26, 2016?
- 6 A No.
- 7 Q You didn't see it?
- 8 A No, I didn't see it.
- 9 Q It appears to be individuals in your group saying we
- 10 | should do something like what this did in Brexit, right?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Somebody says let's fake something like this for Hillary?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q Then the bottom somebody says typical that all of the
- 15 dopey minorities fell for it?
- 16 A Yes, they did.
- 17 Q Was it surprising to you to, again?
- 18 A I don't recall seeing this. I mean, the Brexit thing I
- don't know when Brexit was, but yes, I was surprised to this.
- 20 Q You didn't think anybody would fall for these things?
- 21 A Yes, I didn't think so.
- Q When you saw this, that must have been surprising, right?
- 23 A I don't know what's going on in their heads. I don't
- 24 think I'm surprised that other people might have thought that.
- 25 Q You didn't think that maybe they were gullible?

- ZI A I GOIL C KILOW.
- Q What about Grand Torino DSA?
- 23 A Yeah, I recognize that handle.
- 24 Q So Grand Torino DSA says; Dopey shitlibs will fall for
- 25 that too?

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 764
- 1 A Yes, I see that.
- 2 Q You didn't think that would happen?
- 3 A No. I wasn't in this group either.
- 4 Q I'm just asking you what you would have thought?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q So everyone seems this will work but you?
- 7 A Everyone? I've seen a couple people say it. I didn't
- 8 | see what everyone else said.
- 9 Q Mr. Mackey, one of the accounts you used, the one you
- 10 used for this is was called the Ricky Vaughn, right?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Who gave you that account?
- 13 A I don't recall. Whether it was Amy Stephen or someone
- 14 else.
- 15 O You don't recall?
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q You got it from -- would you be surprised if there was
- documents in evidence indicating that it was Amy Stephen?
- 19 A No, I wouldn't be. I know someone gave it to me.
- 20 Q So who is Amy Stephen?
- 21 A Amy Stephen is a woman on Twitter. She uses the handle
- 22 Amy Stephen.
- 23 Q You found her very useful, didn't you?
- 24 A Useful? Yes, I think so.
- Q Why was she useful?

- 1 A Well, because she was a democrat and we convinced her to
- 2 | -- she went from the left to the right. So any time someone
- 3 | changes their mind then I mean that's useful if you want to
- 4 change other people's minds.
- 5 Q You converted her, right?
- 6 A Yes; that is right.
- 7 Q So when she would retweet your stuff, it got to a whole
- 8 different crowd of people?
- 9 A Right.
- 10 Q It was sort of an objective of Twitter, right? To get
- 11 things out of your group?
- 12 A I don't know that's the objective of Twitter. But yes.
- 13 I think getting things to go viral is definitely an objective
- 14 of Twitter.
- 15 Q Did you ask her to create this account for you?
- 16 A I don't recall. I might have.
- 17 Q Do you remember how you got it from her?
- 18 A No. I don't remember exactly how I got it from her.
- MR. PAULSEN: I'd like to show you some documents
- 20 that we've shared with you. It's Government Exhibit 1004.
- 21 It's not in evidence yet, your Honor. This is the documents
- 22 that we shared earlier.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. PAULSEN: Ms. Parshad do they have the
- 25 redactions we discussed?

- 19 Q Now, you talked in one of the groups about how important
- 20 her conversion was, right?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q What did that allow you to do?
- 23 A What did that allow me to do? She had an audience that
- 24 we could reach.
- 25 Q You talked about how you said that if you sent things,

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 767
- 1 your avatar hat would be there, right?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q It was important to convert people who could push your
- 4 message further, correct?
- 5 A It's important to go viral, to convert people. It's
- 6 politics.
- 7 Q Do you remember she said some nice words about you?
- 8 A Yes she did.
- 9 Q Were you guys always kind to her?
- 10 A No, we weren't.
- 11 Q Why was that?
- 12 A I don't know. That's kind of how we talked. We were
- 13 very vulgar and rude.
- 14 Q Why with her, though?
- 15 A Why with her? I think that's basically, unfortunately,
- 16 back then I was very vulgar and rude. And we would joke and
- 17 say things that weren't nice about other people. That's just
- 18 the reality of it.
- 19 Q Do you recall that --
- 20 MR. PAULSEN: I'd like to show Government
- 21 Exhibit 1004-0009.
- 22 Q Ms. Stephen wrote I love Ricky Vaughn. If only he were
- 23 | 30 years older.
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Do you recall that?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q When you got the account from her, you started mocking
- 3 her divorce; is that right?
- 4 A Yes, I did.
- 5 Q She got divorced in part because of you converting her;
- 6 is that right?
- 7 A Unfortunately, yes.
- 8 Q Were you kind about that?
- 9 A I was not.
- 10 Q Why not?
- 11 A I just -- I don't think I was very kind back then at all.
- 12 Q You wrote that, and I quote; I really did a number on
- 13 her. JFC.
- 14 A Yes, I did.
- 15 Q Why did you say that?
- 16 A Because I was shocked. I was shocked that first of all
- 17 | she would flip, and then it would be so much of a drastic
- 18 change that she would actually divorce her husband.
- 19 Q Did you then, kind of, taunt her divorce in a group
- 20 message?
- 21 A I did, yes.
- 22 Q He cuck by an anon Major League avatar. What does that
- 23 mean?
- 24 A It means basically well, the Major League avatar is Ricky
- Vaughn. Anon is, means anonymous. And he cuck just means.

```
D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                             769
 1
     don't know. It's kind of a vulgar saying but, you know, it's
 2
     kind of vulgar.
 3
               THE COURT: What does JFC mean.
 4
               THE WITNESS: That means Jesus --
 5
               THE COURT: Oh, I see. I get it.
 6
          Who gave you the run of RV account after you got kicked
 7
     off the second time?
 8
          I don't recall. That might have been Amy Stephen, but I
     don't recall.
10
          Who is JBurtonXP?
11
          That's someone I know as JBurtonXP.
12
          Isn't it true he's the one that gave you that account?
13
          I guess it was. I don't recall exactly who gave it to
14
     me.
15
         Who is he?
16
         A Twitter user going by JBurtonXP.
17
         You don't know his name either?
     Q
18
         No.
19
          Why did he give you the account?
20
          I don't know why he gave me the account. He likes my
21
     tweets.
22
               THE COURT: Just to clarify. Why were people giving
23
     you accounts at this point?
24
               THE WITNESS: Because they wanted me back on
25
     Twitter.
```

```
D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN
                                                              770
 1
               THE COURT: Oh, you had been banned at this point?
 2
               THE WITNESS:
                              I had been banned at this point.
 3
               THE COURT: I see. Sorry about that. Go ahead.
 4
          Mr. Mackey, I'd like to ask you about the second tweet,
 5
     this one. This one has a Hispanic woman and it's in Spanish,
 6
     right?
 7
          Yes.
          Do you recall sending that?
          Yes, I did.
 9
     Α
10
          Why did you pick that one?
11
          I saw it on 4chan.
12
          Why that one of any of them?
13
          I just picked a random image on 4chan and shared it on
14
     Twitter.
15
          You had a lot of choices, right?
16
         From those threads, there were just those two images.
17
          You had a sense of what groups were the important voters
18
     for democrats, right?
19
          Yes, I did.
20
          What were those groups?
21
          I think that the African American vote was her most
22
     important constituency. There were others.
23
          What about women voters?
24
          Women voters are an important constituency.
25
               MR. PAULSEN: If I can show just for the parties
```

I mean legal immigrants.

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 169 of 212 PageID #: 2489 D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 773 1 Α Yes. 2 I'm going to show 1005-33, Just to the parties and the 3 Court. Mr. Mackey, did you send that tweet? 5 Yes, I did. Α 6 THE COURT: Any objection other than what we 7 discussed? 8 MR. FRISCH: No. 9 THE COURT: Okay, you can show it. 10 (Government Exhibit 1005-33, was received in 11 evidence.) 12 Mr. Mackey, did you write: Trump won natural born 13 citizens 50 percent to 45 percent, naturalized citizens should 14 not get the vote. 15 Yes, I did. 16 Did you believe that? 17 At the time I believed it. 18 Do you still believe it? 19 Α No. 20 1005-34, just for the parties. 21 Mr. Mackey, did you send that tweet? 22 Yes, I did. 23 THE COURT: Do you have an objection other than what 24 we discussed? 25 MR. FRISCH: That's right.

D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN

774

- 2 (Government Exhibit 1005-34, was received in

THE COURT: You can show it.

3 evidence.)

- 4 Q Mr. Mackey, did you write: Immigrants, the children of
- 5 immigrants, et cetera, cannot be trusted to vote in the
- 6 interests of their new country.
- 7 A Yes, I did say that.
- 8 Q Why did you say that?
- 9 A Because I believed it at the time.
- 10 Q This is the time when you were sending around memes that
- 11 if followed literally would trick people out of voting?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Including ones in Spanish?
- 14 A Yes, one in Spanish.
- 15 Q Mr. Mackey, we mentioned this a moment ago, but you
- 16 | actually didn't think women should vote; is that right?
- 17 A At the time that's what I believed.
- 18 Q Did you change your opinion on that?
- 19 A I have, yes.
- 20 Q You obviously listened to the recording I mentioned a
- 21 moment ago, right?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q That was a serious recording?
- 24 A Yes, it was.
- 25 Q You were speaking sincerely?

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 777

1 (Sidebar conference.)

MR. FRISCH: Here's my concern, I've had this concern from the beginning, which is that this cannot, this trial cannot be a referendum on his political views. There is a point to which enough is enough. We reached the tipping now. A referendum on views that he had, some of these were a year before the election. The Government has made its point. I have my own view of this prosecution.

THE COURT: I sensed that.

MR. FRISCH: But I think that at this point we have reached the tipping point.

He made the point of racism, the point about misogyny, the point of the 19th Amendment. This is piling on. We reached the point; they should move on to something else.

MR. PAULSEN: Only my second tweet on the women issue.

THE COURT: The only thing I'll say about this, you don't have to show him every single one. And I think that one more is all that is necessary. I will say, his responses to the questions initially was he didn't think women should vote because they vote for Democrats. And those weren't what he expressed in those tweets. So I think, I don't think he should be able to say that and not challenge it. I think that part is fine.

I'll let you do one more.

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE

The only other question I had was to the extent to which timing is important on any of these. So for example, if some of these are tweeted or whatever close in time to when he also tweeted this, that has relevance. That is separate and apart from his general attitude.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ PAULSEN: I'll focus on the ones that are closer in time.

MR. FRISCH: The one.

THE COURT: If there is more than one that is close in time. Remind me of the date of this one.

MR. PAULSEN: I don't have it off the top of my head.

THE COURT: Let's not do this one. You have made the point about it. Plus there is the podcast.

I think it's relevant, but I think the relevance of additional ones relate to the placement of them in connection with what is sent out. How many are there?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ PAULSEN: Quite a few. I think you said I could do five. I've only done one.

THE COURT: Okay, but in terms of -- there are different ways to do it. If he acknowledges it that he sent it close in time, then you can say: Have you sent other similarly phrased ones.

Is that fine?

MR. FRISCH: You know I think -- yes, it's fine.

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE Thank you. (End of sidebar conference.) (Continued on the next page.)

Case 1:21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 176 of 212 PageID #: 2496 D. MACKEY - CROSS - MR. PAULSEN 780 1 (In open court.) 2 THE COURT: Did you want to select a different 3 exhibit? 4 MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor, I'll do that. 5 Mr. Mackey do you recall when I played that recording of 6 the podcast in which you said you didn't think women should 7 vote? 8 Yes. Do you recall that I believe your defense counsel asked 9 10 around when the time was, do you remember that? 11 Did he ask that? 12 THE COURT: Do you remember when the time was? 13 THE WITNESS: No, I don't. 14 Do you recall that the podcast was done around 15 March 2016? 16 Yes. 17 Fair to say that your feelings about whether women should 18 vote were not localized around March 2016; is that right? 19 That's right. 20 So is it correct to say on the eve of the election, 21 during the election, you didn't believe women should vote? 22 Yes, it is. 23 Would it surprise you at all if there were a number of tweets from in your account stating that fact? 24

25

No, it wouldn't.

- D. MACKEY CROSS MR. PAULSEN 782
- 1 A I did retweet it; I didn't write it.
- 2 Q You just thought it was a good idea?
- 3 A Yes. I retweeted it.
- 4 Q Would you surprise you that there is similar tweets that
- 5 you wrote?
- 6 A No, it wouldn't surprise me, no.
- 7 Q So a good idea is a good idea, right?
- 8 MR. FRISCH: Objection.
- 9 THE COURT: You can rephrase.
- 10 Q Fair to say that you both tweeted that women shouldn't
- 11 vote and you retweeted that women shouldn't vote?
- 12 A Yes, it is.
- 13 Q That was an idea worth giving out both ways, right?
- 14 A I'm not denying that I believed it. I was just being
- 15 specific that I retweeted, it not tweeted. I'm not denying
- 16 it.
- 17 Q Okay. Just to sum up, you don't think women should vote?
- 18 A I used to.
- MR. FRISCH: Objection.
- 20 THE COURT: Sustained to form. I think he said he
- 21 didn't think so at the time.
- 22 A I didn't think so at the time.
- 23 Q In 2016 you didn't think women should vote?
- 24 A That's right.
- 25 Q In 2016 you didn't think immigrants should vote?

but it's the one that lists I think some Twitter handles and

the number of hashtags. Do you remember what I'm talking

24

D. MACKEY - REDIRECT - MR. FRISCH 784

- 1 about?
- 2 A Yes, the hashtags.
- 3 Q Could you explain, you started to answer Mr. Paulsen's
- 4 question about that, could you give that answer now?
- 5 A Yes. Those were hashtags that I tweeted that were also
- 6 discussed in the chat groups. But those, I'm saying, those
- 7 | tweets, those hashtags, were widely popular. They were
- 8 trending at the time. And all my followers were tweeting
- 9 them. That's kind of what we did.
- 10 We acted as if -- if all my followers are tweeting
- 11 something that's trending, I'm always tweeting about the
- 12 trending hashtags; that's sort of what you do on Twitter,
- 13 especially if everyone is talking about it.
- 14 Q Mr. Mackey, have you ever apologized to anyone, generally
- 15 speaking, for the things you said as Ricky Vaughn?
- 16 A Yes, I have.
- 17 Q To whom have you apologized?
- 18 A To my family.
- 19 Q Why did you apologize?
- 20 A Because it was in bad taste. It was wrong. It was
- 21 offensive.
- 22 Q Do you remember tweeting that feeling when you
- 23 haphazardly posted a meme and it winds up on cable television?
- 24 Did you remember that one?
- 25 A Yes.

Case 1:	21-cr-00080-AMD Document 126 Filed 04/21/23 Page 183 of 212 PageID #: 2503
	PROCEEDINGS 787
1	(In open court.)
2	THE COURT: I'm trying to get a sense from the
3	lawyers where we are next. It looks like I'm going to give
4	you tomorrow off, so we can talk about certain matters. I
5	don't think it would be the best use of your time.
6	Let me ask, which I neglected to do.
7	Do you plan on calling any additional witnesses?
8	MR. FRISCH: I don't. Except for the one matter
9	that we talked about before the jury came in.
10	THE COURT: I see. We'll wait on this.
11	My anticipation is that on Monday you'll hear the
12	parties' summations and my charge on the law. I hope it
13	doesn't bother anybody that you have tomorrow off.
14	Because we aren't going to be together for a little
15	bit, I want to remind you in the most, in the strongest
16	possible terms, the importance of staying away from any
17	coverage of this case whatsoever, in any way shape or form.
18	Don't talk about it with anybody at home, or obviously amongst
19	yourselves. Surely, don't permit anybody to contact you about
20	it.
21	Even though we won't be meeting tomorrow, you know
22	how to reach Ms. Greene. I'm going to excuse you for now.
23	Please have a great three-day weekend. And I'll see
24	Monday morning at 9:30. Thank you so much.
25	(Jury exits the courtroom.)

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Everybody can have a seat. I forgot to bring my charge with me so my law clerk is getting it. I want to address this question of the co-conspirator statements.

This is with the proviso if there is further briefing on it, but I think, so the record is clear, I think Judge Garaufis said before the case was reassigned to me that he was going to follow the protocol that's described in *United States vs.*Geaney.

Pursuant to that protocol, statements offered as co-conspirator statements may be admitted into evidence on a conditional basis subject to the Government meeting its burden of proof to show that the defendant and the declarant or declarants were members. And that the statements were made during the course of and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

After hearing the evidence at the trial, including the proffered statements of the alleged co-conspirators, I find that all of the statements offered in evidence, including those of -- these are all they are Twitter names -- @HalleyBorderCol, @WDFXTEU7, @UnitedActivist, @Mia4trump, @1080P, @BakedAlaska, @Jakekass, @nJeffytee, @ncurveme, Twitter user 79421334054533604, @urpochan, @WDFXTEU8, @MrCharlieCoker, @DonnyJBismarck, @Unspectateur, and Twitter user 250628884, as well as other identified and unidentified individuals who communicated with the defendant or with those individuals in relation to the charged conspiracy on Twitter,

PROCEEDINGS	78

1 4chan, or other messaging platforms.

1.3

Those are admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(E) as an exception to the rule of hearsay. In particular I find that the Government has shown by a preponderance of the evidence, One, there was a conspiracy to injure, oppress, threaten and intimidate one or more people in the free exercise and enjoinment of the right to vote.

Two, that it's members included the defendant and the identified and unidentified individuals listed above or that I just listed.

And three, that the statements were made during the course of and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

As I said, I know that Mr. Frisch wanted to amplify this objection and others, but I think for purposes of a ruling on the record that's my ruling.

Let's turn to the charge. My law clerk sent out the last version of the charge. And I'm just going to start party by party. And we'll start with the defense, whether you have any objections to the charge.

MR. FRISCH: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE COURT: Tell me the first one.

MR. FRISCH: My pages are not numbered, but this looks like paragraph eight, uncharged acts considered for a limited purpose.

,usc 1.2	21-CI-00060-AMD DOCUMENT 120 FIRM 04/21/23 Page 160 01 212 PageID #. 2500
	CHARGE CONFERENCE 790
1	THE COURT: Your pages aren't numbered?
2	MR. FRISCH: They are not numbered. Also, I live
3	like in a tech-free place where nothing works, including my
4	plumbing, but in any event.
5	THE COURT: I don't see
6	MR. FRISCH: But I have section eight, uncharged
7	acts considered for a limited purpose.
8	THE COURT: That's actually three. I don't know if
9	you're working from the same version.
10	MR. FRISCH: I believe this is unless I made a
11	mistake, I printed out the most recent one. If your Honor has
12	a copy of
13	THE COURT: Could we print it out because the
14	numbering is different? There is not a whole lot that changed
15	in it, but it will make things easier for you if you have the
16	same one. Let's take a minute while we're printing it out.
17	MR. BUFORD: If you could print one for us too, that
18	would be great.
19	THE COURT: We'll print it in chambers.
20	The one that I have is uncharged acts considered for
21	a limited purpose. Maybe we can get started on what your
22	objection to this is. I'm not sure how much it applies, I
23	have to say, after
24	MR. FRISCH: I'm not sure I understand why any of
25	this, this is not that kind of case. There is no other I

1 don't get why this is in here at all.

1.3

THE COURT: I think we, in an effort to be prepared, did it before he testified. I don't think I was aware of what was going to be requested, so I think the whole thing can come out, unless you have any objection.

MR. BUFORD: No, your Honor. I think we originally included it to serve the purpose of what I think is now in the charge as the inflammatory statements charge.

THE COURT: I think that's right. So that's out.

There may be other things like that too because we were trying to predict.

MR. FRISCH: The section under cooperating witness testimony. It looks like the second paragraph of that applies to when the defense makes an issue of proffer agreements. I don't think it applies here, or otherwise it doesn't apply here.

THE COURT: I thought he was questioned on this. I thought the agreement came in.

MR. FRISCH: I'm going to read: As part of the cooperation Microchip agreed to testify and the Government agreed that it would not use his testimony against him in any subsequent proceeding. But that's proffer agreement language. I didn't go into the proffer agreements.

THE COURT: Do you want that out?

MR. FRISCH: I think that should come out. It's not

CHARGE CONFERENCE

1 applicable to the case. The last sentence probably is fair.

THE COURT: That's what I think. We'll take out

3 | that first -- I think it's a sentence -- it begins with "as

4 part," it ends with "testimony."

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

19

20

21

22

23

24

Then the next language would be, I think -- the point is for this second sentence about this is not something the Court engaged in, I think that is part of the explanation that the agreement was arranged directly between the witness and the Government and not with the Court.

Any objection to that?

MR. BUFORD: No objection, your Honor.

I apologize, I don't think I received the latest version of the instructions.

14 THE COURT: That's your fault. I'm kidding.

MR. BUFORD: I wasn't seeing this in the last version.

17 THE COURT: I think this is Judge Dearie's charge.
18 We'll give you a chance to see it.

MR. BUFORD: It sounds like we have no objection.

THE COURT: Next thing, Mr. Frisch.

MR. FRISCH: Next thing is, if we turn to the venue section, I have a number of objections to it. I think that the first and second paragraphs I have no objection to. The third paragraph --

THE COURT: Okay.

CHARGE CONFERENCE

MR. FRISCH: So I think as a general matter, these options need to be stated with different introductory language, along the lines of, you may consider whether venue is established if, or something like that. Or venue may be conferred. For example, you may -- I think the first way is better, you may consider, in determining whether venue is proven you may consider XYZ.

THE COURT: The intro, the first sentence of that paragraph, instructs the jury that it may consider a number of things.

MR. FRISCH: But then the language comes from an invitation to consider, to language which I read as being more, this is venue. I think the venue --

THE COURT: I think that's correct, though. Is it not correct that venue can be conferred based on physical presence or conduct?

MR. FRISCH: Yes. But however, I think the language should be -- I'm speaking too quickly, thank you.

You may consider a number of things. For example, you can consider if venue -- it just reads as if you're directing a ruling on venue.

THE COURT: I think if you read it again -- I'm perfectly happy to consider amendments to it, but I think these are just statements of the law, and so an explanation of how venue can be considered. In much the same way as how a

1 jury determines intent or how a jury determines anything.

2 These are just the ways in which venue can be established.

I'm just thinking if there -- these are all ways that venue can be established. I don't know how else to phrase it.

MR. FRISCH: If I can? One suggestion, reading it again, maybe I read it too quickly the first time, didn't read it in the context of the first sentence. If you go to the fourth sentence of the paragraph, you can say, they still have to make a finding that the communications and the impulses, or whatever, they still have to find that --

THE COURT: Why don't I insert a sentence that says that at the end.

MR. FRISCH: You can do that, in addition to you could say, venue may lie in any district where electronic venue may be proper, where -- that kind of thing, gives them an opportunity to find it as opposed to otherwise.

MR. BUFORD: I think the instruction as written is an accurate statement of the law. I think the instruction overall makes clear the jury has to find it. I don't object to the phrasing in each of the sentences that precedes this

one, as venue can be, can be, can be; and this is one venue

lies in any district. We don't object to venue can be.

THE COURT: Okay. So venue can be. I think that

THE COURT: Something you want to say about that?

CHARGE CONFERENCE addresses your concern. And then maybe you want to change, the venue is proper. So venue can also -- or maybe you can say there can also be venue. (Continued on next page.)

CHARGE CONFERENCE

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, if I may. I think the concern there is if you say venue can be in any district, that suggests that even if we prove that, that venue is only, it can be, that is isn't quite literally established, which is what the law is.

opinion, that the odds of the jury focusing on this, the can be versus may be versus will, I think are slim to none. And slim just left town. But it's not — but I think these are accurate statements of the law. What I will do because we do have some time, I'll see if there's another way we can phrase it. But I do take the point that I'm instructing them on the law, and this is what the law is. I think the way to fix it or to address the concern that you have is to emphasize that determining whether any of these things exist is for the jury to determine. The law is X, Y, and Z. Is it up to you to determine whether the Government has proved those things. I think that will fix what you're, what you've, what you're concerned about.

MR. PAULSEN: Your Honor, I would only add there was a motion to dismiss in this case based on venue, which I think your Honor knows. There was an argument frankly during Mr. Mackey's testimony. They're pushing this issue, so...

THE COURT: That does not surprise me. They said it, yeah. I know . That's why he wants the instruction to be

CHARGE CONFERENCE 797 1 accurate. I mean --2 MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: I don't think he's trying to trick me, are you? 5 MR. FRISCH: Not now. THE COURT: So we'll add another sentence in there 6 7 that I think will address this. 8 What's next? MR. FRISCH: The next is the next paragraph. I 9 10 think the paragraph that we just discussed; does the venue 11 trick, so to speak, I don't think we need the next paragraph. 12 THE COURT: Well, I think it has to be clear that -oh, it has to be clear that it doesn't have to be the 13 14 defendant who is here, because you did make a point of that in your examination and your opening that he wasn't here. But 15 16 I think it has to be clarified that what would be sufficient. 17 So I don't, I don't think that should be taken out. 18 MR. FRISCH: Well, you already say that. I agree 19 with that you just said that concept needs to be explained, 20 but that's in the end of the second paragraph. 21 THE COURT: Well, I think you have to make it clear 22 that it's any of these people that can do it. You know, the 23 other I mean, the other issue is that you at one point had asserted that the Clinton campaign was a victim, and I don't 24

think that's the Government's position. And, you know, I

25

in a way that's detrimental to your argument.

CHARGE CONFERENCE

think which have to be specific about that because the Clinton campaign was headquartered in Brooklyn. And I think that could be something that could be, I mean, could be confusing

MR. FRISCH: Well, there's two different issues here. Just for the record. There's the issue of venue, whether there's venue in the Eastern District of New York for this charge, and a separate issue is the argument that we had earlier today which is not a venue argument. It's a question of whether the 302s are material and exculpatory. I think those are two different.

THE COURT: I understand that, but I'm not charging myself, so -- well, I'm concerned is what the jury might think because the Clinton campaign is headquartered here that that could be a basis for venue. It's not unreasonable to a lay person and that's why I think it has to be explicit what we're talk about. So that's the reason why we're doing that. I'll take a look and see if there's something else that, you know, that can be added, but I'm not I'm not going to take those things out.

All right. What's the next one.

MR. FRISCH: The next one is, one moment. This is

-- so this is a proposed language -- I'm sorry. Acts and
statements of coconspirators at the end. I propose adding
language along the following lines. Before considering such

CHARGE CONFERENCE

statements, however, you first must find that the particular person at issue was part of the charged conspiracy and had the same intent as the defendant.

THE COURT: I think that's in the last paragraph.

And I actually don't think that's the law, that they have to share the same intent. Just general conspiracy. I could be wrong about that. But I don't know that every member of the conspiracy has to share -- I mean, people can be unwitting parts of the conspiracy. I'm not sure that's applicable here. But I don't think it's the law that every conspiracy has to share the same intent.

MR. FRISCH: I think that's true in some cases.

THE COURT: I read it in a Supreme Court opinion.

MR. FRISCH: I'm not saying it's not the law, but it doesn't apply to this case. There's only one, there's only one bucket of criminal — bucket is the wrong word. But there's only one thing of criminal intent, it's this conspiracy. It's not like there's some other conspiracy and it 's admitted under 801 as sufficiently reliable under another conspiracy here. There's just this conspiracy.

THE COURT: But it doesn't change the fact that the rule of conspiracies, whether it is that not every member, I believe, has to share the intent. And I think we go on to discuss this, correct me if I'm wrong, isn't this in the next section, elements of the existence of the conspiracy? So the

membership and this is, just when we're talking about the

CHARGE CONFERENCE

800

elements of the crime. There's a long and detailed discussion about each element. And I'm quite certain that it takes into account what your concerns are. And so there's a whole section about mere presence or mere association or even knowledge or acquiescence that all of those things are not sufficient. And so I think it's pretty detailed about what the jury has to find. And, in fact, that we say the conspirators do not have to agree on every detail of their venture, but they must agree on the essential nature of their

plan to achieve a specified, unlawful act. That's a correct

statement of the law and I think it covers what you want to

MR. FRISCH: Ready for the next?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FRISCH: So under the second element defendant's membership, fifth paragraph. I think the language here needs to be tweaked a little to reflect this case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FRISCH: So, for example, I want to caution you

--

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

cover.

THE COURT: You're going to read it much more

23 slowly.

MR. FRISCH: I want to caution you, however, that the defendant's mere presence at the scene of activities. I

CHARGE CONFERENCE

mean, it's not clear that any of this is criminal activities, or at locations frequented by alleged coconspirators does not, by itself, make him or her a member of the conspiracy.

mean, this is a standard conspiracy charge language, but we can change it to -- I sort of like to think through before I tweek language that is a standard conspiracy charge. So the Government is charging that this is a criminal activity. And so I think, again, I think it's in your interest too, to have the jury's attention focused to the conduct that is the alleged crime. You may disagree that it's a crime, but it's what's charged. So I think you have to specify that it's a criminal activity because you, I suppose you can conspire to do all kinds of things, but I think that's the reason for the language.

MR. FRISCH: What about mere presence at the scene of alleged criminal activities? And I reason I'm concerned about this paragraph, there's more language down at the bottom is that while this a standard charge, the standard application is drug dealing and armed robbery and whatever else.

THE COURT: I just gave it in a completely different case. I've given it in several. It's not just those. I gave it in the R Kelly case. It's not any of those, so this is the standard --

MR. FRISCH: But that was a -- I don't know that's a

1 | crime. It's obvious what happened in this case is a crime.

THE COURT: Not to them.

MR. FRISCH: Because it almost assumes that there's some criminal activity here. I mean, another option here is the alleged criminal activity to make it more case specific.

THE COURT: The only reason I'm just quibbling with you here is because this is what the law is . And so the law -- and it's, and it's specific to direct the jury to the activity at issue. I'm not sure what adding alleged mean. I mean, do you have an opinion about that?

MR. BUFORD: Your Honor, I think the scenario that's contemplated here is the jury concludes there's criminal activity, and then the caution is just because there is criminal activity and the defendant is present, doesn't mean he joined in the conspiracy. So I think that's the reason the language is there and that's why the instruction is written the way it is.

THE COURT: I don't -- you know, I guess everybody has their own interpretation of things, but this is not designed to be, and is not in my view, a harmful instruction to Mr. Mackey. Because it's, even if you can say alleged but let's say it really is a criminal activity and they believe that, but he's just merely present at that, they can't find him guilty. So I don't, I'm always weary about tinkering with these things because I think that's to his benefit. I'm

inclined to leave it that way, unless you have strong feelings about it and there's some other charge that you've seen that you think works better. But I think this is the purpose of this is really to protect Mr. Mackey.

Anything else.

MR. FRISCH: Yes. So in the paragraph, the paragraph that begins the indictment alleges that the objective of the charged conspiracy was to injure.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FRISCH: So there's two things. Let me do the more maybe the -- let me do both of them. So section 241 has two separate sentences. One sentence has the four verbs; injure oppress, threaten, and intimidate. And the next sentence which covers a different class of conduct has the language hinder and prevent.

THE COURT: I think it's actually or. I think this is the language of the indictment but I think the statute says or, doesn't it?

MR. FRISCH: Whatever I wasn't focusing on that. I was -- the statute and the crime is injure, oppress, threaten, and whether it's and or intimidate. However, there's a second sentence, a completely separate clause of the statute which defines a different crime and that crime uses language of hinder or prevent. And the history of the statute, as I understand it, which is the Klu Klux Klan act of the 1800s is

CHARGE CONFERENCE

that the language of hinder and prevent -- I don't have the statute in front of me, is precisely so that white hooded folks literally did not stop African Americans from walking on the highway. And so, you know.

THE COURT: What are you asking me to do?

MR. FRISCH: Take out hinder and prevent because it applies to a different section of the statute which is not charged.

THE COURT: Is this the language of the indictment?

MR. FRISCH: No. Hinder and prevent is not in the indictment.

THE COURT: Oh, so we should take it out then. No, wait. Is this language -- I'm trying to find what the indictment says. So the statute says if two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right privilege secured to him by the Constitution of the laws of the United States, or because of him having exercised the same, they shall be punished. And the indictment charges that he conspired to injure, oppress, threaten and intimidate one or more persons in the free exercise and enjoyment. Oh, it's not in the indictment.

MR. PAULSEN: No, your Honor. So the indictment merely tracks the statute. There's, there are jury instructions on 241 charges that elaborate what those words

mean, and Judge Garaufis had an extensive discussion of this in his opinion about what operative words one could use to characterize what could constitute an injury. That's where what language comes from. There have been, you know, a hundred years of 241 cases in which the words have been characterized.

So injury in this case which is what we are relying upon, has been construed in Judge Garaufis' opinion to include things like prevent and hinder.

MR. FRISCH: So --

THE COURT: Wait. Oh, oh, I see what you're saying.

MR. BUFORD: They're defining --

THE COURT: I thought you were complaining about the first sentence, that's why I'm confused. So your complaint is the definitely of injure. That the Government has alleged that it was to injure one or more people in the free exercise and enjoyment of their right to vote. I instruct you that the statute covers conduct intended to hinder, prevent, frustrate, make difficult, or indirectly rather than directly assault free exercise of the right.

So these are the definitions of injure. And you object to that?

MR. FRISCH: I object in two respects, but the more
-- let me put both of them. I believe that to include
language of prevent or hinder in a jury charge under the first

806

1 sentence of this section, would inappropriately inject into

2 the first sentence what congress did not intend to be there.

3 That is, prevent -- there's two different types of things

4 going on in this statute.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second thing is if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, that's means Klu Klux Klan people on the highway or on the premises of another with intent to prevent or hinder. That's a different harm.

THE COURT: And this is what you argued in the motion to dismiss?

MR. PAULSEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: My recollection is that you --

MR. FRISCH: It's moot --

THE COURT: You didn't win.

MR. FRISCH: I don't have Judge Garaufis' opinion in front of me. But now I'm in front of Judge Donnelly.

17 THE COURT: But I'm not revisiting what Judge

18 Garaufis did.

MR. FRISCH: You may decide to do that, but my view is that if this jury is charged that they can find Mr. Mackey guilty based on preventing or hindering, that inoperative verb is not applicable to the charged crime are being incorporated into the jury charge in this case. If that's what Judge Garaufis said or that's what he meant, I believe, with due respect, Judge Garaufis is wrong.

THE COURT: I think he probably knows that. I think he probably knows what your opinion is. But my only point in referencing to that was I think this argument was rejected on the motion to dismiss. Obviously, the motion to dismiss, should there be a conviction, will be a subject of an appeal. But I think for purposes of the jury charge, that this is, these definitions are appropriate. And I think they are based on other 241 cases, aren't they?

MR. BUFORD: Yes, your Honor.

MR. FRISCH: Here's the other problem with, the other objection I have to this, which is related to what we're talking about. The indictment alleges all four verbs that are

in the first sentence of the, of this statute.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FRISCH: Our view is that all four of them, while the Government may choose injury as the one it likes best, the context of the four verbs informs the jury's consideration of what the injury is. In other words; congress had a respect intent and target in drafting this language using injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate. There is a threat of commonality among those four words.

THE COURT: But if they're in the alternative, and so they wouldn't just be, you know, at the same adjective.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ FRISCH: I take that point and if your Honor were to take out -- just hear me out. If your Honor -- what

1 makes it a problem is the use of the word prevent or hinder .

2 I mean, if you take out the other three verbs; oppress,

3 threaten, or intimidate, and I understand it's in the

the reason I'm not revisiting it. But --

4 conjunctive, and then you put in prevent or hindre, as a

definition of injure, you 're just rewriting the statute or

Judge Garaufis is rewriting the statute, with due respect.

THE COURT: I mean, my recollection of Judge

Garaufis' conclusion, and now I'm looking at it, is that he

cited at least three decisions as the reason for his

conclusion. And I mean, I take your point that you 're not

asking me to re-- to revisit his decision, because I'm a judge

of coordinate jurisdiction, so I don't even think I have the

power to do that anyway. But I mean, perhaps I do, that's not

MR. FRISCH: One other point to make and this is —
it just happens to be the case whether the Government's right
about this or not, that this statute has never been applied to
the kind of conduct in this case. Maybe that's just the way
it is and we're there now. But the language or prior jury
charges, I don't think the judges in those cases, the judges
in those cases, we know did not have disinformation on the
internet in mind when they drafted this charge. And I think
that should put us, puts us in a different place than just to
follow other charges or other cases where the nature of the
action is different than it is here.

809

THE COURT: All right. I think -- do you have anything else you want to say about this?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUFORD: I would just say, your Honor, that rightly or wrongly Judge Garaufis has concluded at page 33 and 34 of his opinion that this is the law with respect to Section 241, and our position would be it would be strange for the parties and the Court to know the law, but the jury that has to apply it to the facts to not have the benefit of that.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, as I say, these are two slightly different things. I suppose a judge could, you know. The new judge coming in can have a different view. I don't happen to have a different view under, at this point. So I agree with Judge Garaufis. And of course, that decision, his decision and I guess my agreement with it is something that the Circuit can set us straight on if they think we're wrong, if there's a conviction. But I'm going to leave the instructions for the way they are. I mean, it's certainly true that, that nobody in those cases envisioned what -- I mean what happened in this case or the way that the internet changed the way people interact with one another, the way information gets spread. But I mean even since 2016, things are quite different. I mean, some of this we're looking at through a 2023 lens that people probably weren't thinking about in 2016. But I think that's, you know, laws are designed to be applied to all kinds of cases and whether, you

810

1 know, whether this one is appropriately applied to this

2 | factual scenario is something that that courts will eventually

resolve. We've resolved it this way and if we're wrong about

that, the Second Circuit will tell us.

Anything else in this section?

MR. FRISCH: I think that is all I have.

THE COURT: What about the Government? Anything

that you want to bring to my attention?

MR. BUFORD: Your Honor, if you can bear with me one

10 second.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

21

24

11 THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BUFORD: Your Honor, it's a small point, but on

13 page 13 I think we only had testimony from one law enforcement

14 agent.

THE COURT: Okay, yeah. On page 13 you said?

MR. BUFORD: It was on page 13, subsection C.

17 THE COURT: Law enforcement witness. Well let's

18 see, is that right? I guess that is right. We just had the

19 one guy. Okay.

MR. BUFORD: I take it back, your Honor. Joel

DeCapua. He's an expert, so I quess he's in a different

22 category.

23 THE COURT: He's law enforcement though, right? So

let's leave it the way it is. All right. Did you want me to

25 say what their expertise was? I don't know if I said that.

MR. BUFORD: With respect to, on the bottom of page 15, in subsection H, there is an uncalled witnesses equally available, that instructs the jury that they shouldn't draw any inferences or conclusions what people would have testified to had they been called as a witness.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BUFORD: Then in the next section, seven, in the second paragraph, there is an instruction that both sides have subpoena power, but if either side could have called a witness and didn't, it says that the jury can draw an adverse inference against that party. I think the law is usually that you sort of pick one or the other of these instructions.

THE COURT: I don't think we need this. Let's be clear, all witnesses -- I think you're right about that.

MR. BUFORD: Our preference would be to have subsection H, the uncalled witnesses equally available.

THE COURT: I think that's right. I think this is not correct for this case.

Do you have any problem with that Mr. Frisch?,

MR. FRISCH: I don't.

THE COURT: Next one.

MR. BUFORD: Page 21, subsection D, intent, in the second paragraph there is language about how the defendant doesn't have to be aware of the specific law, but must know that they act with a specific intent to do what the law

1 In Section 241 cases, the specific intent is often 2 defined that the defendant know that there is a protected 3 right, and then specifically set out to interfere with it. And if the Government establishes that, it has established the 4 5 specific intent such that the defendant has necessarily acted 6 with the requisite knowledge of interfering with the protected 7 right. THE COURT: So we should take this out? 8 MR. BUFORD: Our recommendation is to take it out, 9 10 or refer the jury to the section of substantive instruction 11 where the Court instructs what you have to find to have the 12 person be a member of the conspiracy. 1.3 THE COURT: I think that's right, don't you, 14 Mr. Frisch? 15 MR. FRISCH: Can I think about this? We don't have 16 to do it right now. I'm uncomfortable taking out that 17 language and replacing it with something. Incorporating the 18 other concept into here makes more sense to me, maybe I need 19 to think about it. 20 THE COURT: Maybe what you could do is propose 21 language to me that would fit in there. If you could let me 22 know, that would be great. 23 Anything else. 24 MR. BUFORD: Bear with me for one second, your

That's all from us.

25

Honor. I think that's it.

THE COURT: The only dispute about the verdict sheet, I can't remember what I've done in these cases before, is whether there is a separate question for venue. I don't think it's required or just how do you find the defendant. I think I've instructed the jury that they have to find venue so you could just have the question.

But what is your objection to it?

MR. BUFORD: We do object just because we've looked at other cases and haven't found any examples where the jury has been asked separately on the venue form — on the verdict form, to find venue, including recent cases like the Ng case, MDB and Barrack case, which was hotly contested. I think the Court instructs they have to find venue. We haven't seen it on a verdict form. I don't know that it's necessary to call it out necessarily.

THE COURT: Do you have case law on the subject or just something you wanted to draw their attention to?

MR. FRISCH: I want to draw their attention to. I can't remember, I don't have case law on my fingertips.

THE COURT: If there is some and you can provide me with it, I'll take a look at it. My recollection, when venue is more than a passing issue, I did not do a separate question on it. But if there is something out there that I'm missing, just alert me to it. I'll let you know that one on Monday.

Anything else?

1.3

Case 1:2	21-cr-00080-AMD Document	126 Filed 04/21/23	Page 212 of 212 Page	eID #: 2532
				816
1		INDEX		
2	WITNESS		PAGE	
3	DOUGLASS MACKEY			
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION	BY MR. FRISCH	643	
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION		701	
6	REDIRECT EXAMINATION		783	
7				
8		EXHIBIT	S	
9	DEFENSE		PAGE	
10	С		661	
11	GOVERNMENT		PAGE	
12	1005-23		721	
13	1005-25		723	
14	1005-26		724	
15	1005-27		726	
16	1005-28		727	
17	1005-29		728	
18	1005-24		729	
19	104		766	
20	1005-33		773	
21	1005-34		774	
22	1005-19		776	
23	1005-21		781	
24				
25				